DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 500 UD 027 290

AUTHOR	Schoener, John E.
TITLE	Middle School Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) Program 1987-88. OREA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE	Nov 89
NOTE	109p.; For 1986-87 report, see ED 297 066.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Failure; *Attendance Patterns; *Dropout Prevention; Educational Environment; High Risk Students; Improvement Programs; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Middle Schools; *Potential Dropouts; Program Effectiveness; School Counseling; School Holding Power; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the effectiveness of the Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (AIDP) program during the 1987-88 school year, which provided services to New York City (New York) middle school students at risk of becoming truant or dropping out of school. Chapter 1, "Introduction," contains the following sections: (1) "Background"; (2) "Performance Objectives"; (3) "Evaluation Objectives"; (4) "Evaluation Procedures"; and (5) "Organization of the Report." Chapter 2, "Summary of Citywide Program," contains the following sections: (1) "Program Participants"; (2) "Program Implementation"; (3) "Citywide Program Outcomes"; (4) "Changes in AIDP Student Attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88"; (5) "Changes in AIDP Students' Academic Achievement from 1986-87 to 1987-88"; (6) "Relationship Between Outcomes and Student Variables"; and (7) "Relationship Between Program Variables and Attendance." Chapter 3, "Individual Programs in School Context," contains the following sections: (1) "Literature Review"; (2) "Student Outcomes in Sample Schools"; (3) "Demographics of Sample Schools"; and (4) "Program Variation Among Schools." Chapter 4, "Outcome Predictors and Implications for Program Success," contains the following sections: (1) "Analysis Methods"; (2) "Variables Related to Attendance Outcomes"; (3) "Variables Related to Achievement Outcomes"; (4) "Negative Factors"; and (5) "Implications for Successful AIDP Programs." Chapter 5 contains conclusions about the program's effectiveness. Chapter 6 contains recommendations on how to improve the program. Twenty-five tables are included, and a list of 20 references. A description of the Effective School Battery and a summary of significant correlations are appended. (JS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OREA Report

MIDDLE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT
DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I.D.P.) PROGRAM
1987-88

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Tobias
Office of Research Evaluation and Assessment, New York City
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT
John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator

November 1989

MIDDLE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I.D.P.) PROGRAM 1987-88

Prepared by the OREA
Student Progress Evaluation Unit

Henry Solomon
Evaluation Manager

Ida Heyman
Evaluation Associate

Nancy Yacker
Renee Elder
Evaluation Consultants

William F. Hilton, Jr.
Augustus Olu-Hamilton
Evaluation Analysts

New York City Public Schools
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
President

Dr. Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Dr. Gwendolyn C. Baker
Amalia V. Betanzos
Dr. Stephen R. Franse
James F. Regan
Edward L. Sadowsky

Bernard Mecklowitz
Chancellor

Dr. Dolores M. Fernandez
Deputy Chancellor for Instruction and Development

Dr. Harvey Robins
Deputy Chancellor for Financial Affairs

Joseph J. Saccente
Chief Executive for Operations

Amy Linden
Chief Executive for School Facilities

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws, including Title IX and Section 504, may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office of Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

5/22/89

(11)

ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I.D.P.) PROGRAM IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOLS 1987-88

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) program is a state-funded program providing services to middle school students at risk of becoming truant or dropping out of school. The program has been in operation since 1984-85 and in its present form since 1985-86. Schools were selected to receive A.I.D.P. funds if they had an attendance rate at or below the citywide median in 1985. With a few exceptions, schools selected in 1985 were funded for three years. Students were selected primarily on the basis of their prior year's attendance patterns, with academic achievement (indicated by the number of courses they failed, reading scores, or whether they had been held over) taken into account. During 1987-88 the program served approximately 11,765 students in 69 schools.

Evaluation Methodology

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) obtained data for this evaluation from several sources. Citywide data on student selection and program services received by students were collected from files maintained by the Office of Student Progress (O.S.P.) on every A.I.D.P. student. OREA collected certain outcome data, such as test scores, and obtained attendance data from the Office of Educational Data Services (O.E.D.S.).

The qualitative evaluation focused on the relationship between student outcomes and both program implementation and school climate. OREA selected a stratified random sample of 18 A.I.D.P. middle schools to study in depth. At each school site, OREA staff interviewed the A.I.D.P. facilitator and school principal about school characteristics and program implementation and integration. In addition, they administered questionnaires to a sample of students and teachers to measure school climate. OREA obtained additional data on relevant school characteristics from the central files at the Board of Education.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Student Characteristics

The A.I.D.P. middle school program served 11,765 students across the city. Approximately one-third of the students were in seventh grade, one-third in eighth grade, and 13 percent in ninth grade. Although schools could include sixth grade middle school students who met the eligibility criteria, only 659 such students (5.6 percent of the total) were served by the program. Nearly

ten percent of the entire A.I.D.P. student population was in special education programs.

Overall, 22.7 percent of the students had been in the program the previous year. There were 9.2 percent more males than females. Seventeen percent of the students were overage for their grade. Slightly fewer than seven percent of the students were LEP-entitled. Fewer than two percent of the program students lived in temporary housing.

Implementation

The middle school A.I.D.P. program was to fund five mandated categories of service and one optional service. They were:

- Attendance Outreach
- Guidance Services
- Attendance Incentives
- High School Linkage Activities
- Health Services
- Extended School Day Activities (optional)

Each A.I.D.P. student was to receive services in the five mandated categories.

The Attendance Outreach and Guidance components were particularly well implemented. Almost all A.I.D.P. students received attendance outreach (99.2 percent) and 85.0 percent of the students received guidance services. Sixty-one percent received attendance incentives and 37.0 percent participated in high school linkage activities. The smallest percentage of students participated in extended school day activities (35.1 percent).

In addition to the above A.I.D.P.-funded services, all A.I.D.P. students were to receive alternative education funded by P.C.E.N. during the school day. This was to be either in the form of remedial classes in reading, writing, or mathematics, or in enrichment activities such as career education. Students could receive one or more instructional activities depending on identified needs.

Approximately half of the students (49.1 percent) received alternative education services. The majority of those students received remediation, with the largest group receiving remedial mathematics. Only 21.8 percent of program students participated in enrichment classes.

Citywide Outcomes

In 1987-88, the Chancellor set the following objective for student attendance for the A.I.D.P. program:

- A minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with dropout prevention services will have 1987-88 attendance that is better than in 1986-87.

Citywide data from O.E.D.S. show that while the program approached this objective, with an increase in the attendance rate of 47.7 percent of the students, it did not quite meet it. Further, the percentage of students who improved their attendance declined 4.1 points compared to the previous year. Not surprisingly, the overall mean attendance rate also declined 2.1 points, from 79.0 in 1986-87 to 76.9 percent in 1987-88.

A subgroup of A.I.D.P. students, selected mainly on the basis of attendance criteria, was compared to a sample of middle school students who met the same attendance criteria but were not served by the program. Although the groups had similar median attendance in 1986-87, the A.I.D.P. group had a higher proportion of students who improved their attendance in 1987-88 (52.4 percent) than did the comparison group (48.7 percent).

The Chancellor established the following achievement objectives for A.I.D.P. in 1987-88:

- A minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with dropout prevention services will pass at least one more subject in 1987-88 than they did in 1986-87. (This applies only to those students who failed one or more subjects in 1986-87.)

- A minimum of 50 percent of the middle school students provided with dropout services will be promoted to the next highest grade at the end of the school year.

Because the number and type of classes offered in middle schools vary from school to school and from grade level to grade level within schools, OREA used course pass rate rather than the number of courses passed, as a means of comparison between the two years. In terms of course pass rates, the data show that the program met and exceeded the Chancellor's objective--65.6 percent of the students who failed at least one subject in 1986-87 increased their pass rate in 1987-88. (By comparison, 12.6 percent fewer A.I.D.P. students had improved their course pass rates in the 1986-87 program.) The mean pass rate for program students overall increased from 70.4 to 71.2 percent, a gain of 0.8 points.

The A.I.D.P. program also met and exceeded the second objective for achievement. Only 1,095 or 9.3 percent of the program students were projected as being held over in the spring of 1988. A disproportionately large percentage of these students was male.

Finally, OREA looked at D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores of program students for 1986-87 and 1987-88. Students in all grades made gains in reading and mathematics, although sixth grade students made smaller gains than would be expected in a year's time.

Outcomes in Sample Schools

Among the 18 A.I.D.P. middle schools in the in-depth-study sample, seven met the Chancellor's objective for attendance. In seven schools the percentage of program students whose attendance increased in 1987-88 was greater than it had been in 1986-87. In ten schools, however, the percentage of students whose attendance improved in 1987-88 was smaller than the percentage whose attendance improved the previous year. In one school the percentage of students whose attendance improved stayed the same.

In six sample schools the overall attendance rate improved or stayed the same while the overall attendance rate declined in 12 schools. Fifteen of the sample schools met the Chancellors' achievement objective for increasing course pass rates. The mean course pass rate increased in ten schools and decreased in eight.

All schools in the sample showed increases in D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores.

Characteristics Related to Successful Schools

Sample school A.I.D.P. programs that were successful in improving student attendance tended to have a combination of program and school characteristics in common. In general, programs in schools in which principals demonstrated strong leadership, lent support to A.I.D.P. and non-A.I.D.P. staff, and established clear rules for students--including a mandatory in-school lunch policy--tended to have higher overall mean attendance rates for A.I.D.P. students and higher percentages of A.I.D.P. students whose attendance improved. Schools in which A.I.D.P. programs provided extensive family outreach by phone, mail and home visits, and guidance sessions with parents and groups of students, tended to be more successful in improving the attendance and course pass rates of their students.

This evaluation also identified groups of students who may be at relatively greater risk for poor attendance than the A.I.D.P. population at large. A.I.D.P. programs in schools in which there was a large percentage of students without telephones in their homes were less successful in increasing student attendance. These same schools tended to have a large percentage of Hispanic students, some of whom were LEP-entitled and some of whom were not. Since the outcomes of LEP students in A.I.D.P. overall were at least on par with other A.I.D.P. students, those Hispanic students who were not eligible to receive LEP services

may nevertheless require language-related and other educational supports.

In addition, male students appear to be at greater risk, since a disproportionate percentage of males was projected to be held over in 1988-89. Finally, of all subgroups, students in temporary housing had the lowest percentage of students whose attendance improved.

In summary, the success of the A.I.D.P. programs, in large part, is contingent upon positive school climate and appropriate matching of services to students. A concerted effort must be made to provide services for students who are at relatively greater risk and cannot benefit from the traditional outreach strategies.

Program recommendations include flexible guidelines to accommodate differences among schools; finding more effective methods of attendance outreach to students with no home telephones; providing in-school instructional supports as well as appropriate outreach to Hispanic students who are not LEP-entitled; increasing parent involvement activities--especially parent guidance sessions; increasing cooperative activities such as group guidance sessions for students; and more effectively implementing the alternative education component.

Recommendations for A.I.D.P. schools include making student attendance a schoolwide priority, implementing mandatory in-school lunch programs, and sustaining the involvement and support of the school principal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was the result of the sustained collaborative effort of many people, including full-time and part-time staff and consultants. Ida Heyman, Renee Elder, and Nancy Yacker designed and coordinated the evaluation. Renee Elder, Hannah Grossman, Ida Heyman, Henry Solomon, and Nancy Yacker participated in site visits. Jeff Verschell and Renee Schmerler assisted in organizing data for analysis. Data analyses were conducted by Renee Elder, William Hilton, and Augustus Olu-Hamilton, assisted by Monique Granville. Shaun Britton and Pang Chu prepared the tables for presentation. The report was conceptualized by Ida Heyman and written by Ida Heyman, Nancy Yacker, Carol Meyer, and Henry Solomon and edited by Joan Katz. The final report was typed by Pamela Jenkins-Polycarpe.

Thanks are due to the individuals involved in A.I.D.P., including O.S.P. personnel, A.I.D.P. district coordinators, staff, and students, as well as school principals, who gave generously of their time and ideas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Performance Objectives	4
	Evaluation Objectives	4
	Evaluation Procedures	5
	Organization of the Report	7
II.	SUMMARY OF CITYWIDE PROGRAM	10
	Program Participants	10
	Program Implementation	13
	Citywide Program Outcomes	24
	Changes in A.I.D.P. Student Attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88	24
	Changes in A.I.D.P. Students' Academic Achievement from 1986-87 to 1987-88	26
	Relationship Between Outcomes and Student Variables	28
	Relationship Between Program Variables and Attendance	35
III.	INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL CONTEXT	40
	Literature Review	40
	Student Outcomes in Sample Schools	45
	Demographics of Sample Schools	48
	Program Variation Among Schools	52
IV.	OUTCOME PREDICTORS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM SUCCESS	65
	Analysis Methods	65
	Variables Related to Attendance Outcomes	65
	Variables Related to Achievement Outcomes	67
	Negative Factors	71
	Implications for Successful A.I.D.P. Programs	72
V.	CONCLUSIONS	77
VI.	RECOMMENDATIONS	81
REFERENCES		84
APPENDIX A:		86
APPENDIX B:		

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1:	Number and Percent of A.I.D.P. Students Selected by Criteria	11
TABLE 2:	Months in Program	15
TABLE 3:	Number and Percent of Students Who Received A.I.D.P. Services	17
TABLE 4:	Number and Percent of Students Receiving Attendance Outreach Services	18
TABLE 5:	Number and Percent of Students Who Received A.I.D.P. Guidance Services	19
TABLE 6:	Number and Percent of A.I.D.P. Services Students Received During 1987-88.	20
TABLE 7:	Alternative Education Services Students Received	21
TABLE 8:	A Comparison of 1986-87 and 1987-88 Attendance Outreach Contacts Received by A.I.D.P. Students	23
TABLE 9:	A Comparison of 1986-87 and 1987-88 Guidance Service Contacts Received by A.I.D.P. Students	25
TABLE 10:	Overall Attendance Rate of A.I.D.P. Students in 1986-87 and 1987-88	27
TABLE 11:	Academic Outcomes of A.I.D.P. Students in 1986-87 and 1987-88	29
TABLE 12:	A.I.D.P. Student Subgroups and Attendance Outcomes	31
TABLE 13:	A.I.D.P. Student Subgroups and Achievement Outcomes	32
TABLE 14:	Comparison of Attendance Rates for the 1987-88 Middle School A.I.D.P. Students and Attendance-Eligible, Non-Served Middle School Students	36
TABLE 15:	Relationship Between Multiple A.I.D.P. and Alternative Education Services and Attendance Change	37
TABLE 16:	Attendance Outcomes for A.I.D.P. Students in Sample Schools	47

PAGE

TABLE 17: Achievement Outcomes for A.I.D.P. Students in Sample Schools 49

TABLE 18: Demographic Characteristics of the 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools 51

TABLE 19: Percent of Students Receiving Alternative Education Service in 18 Sample Middle Schools by School Rank 55

TABLE 20: Percent of Students Receiving Attendance Services in 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools by School Rank and Mean Number of Service Contacts 57

TABLE 21: Percent of Students Receiving Guidance Services in Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools by School Rank 59

TABLE 22: Percent of Students Receiving Other A.I.D.P. Services in 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools by School Rank 60

TABLE 23: Characteristics of the A.I.D.P. Populations in the 18 Sample Middle Schools in 1987-88, by School Rank 61

TABLE A-1: Reliability Results for Teacher Response on The Effective School Battery 88

TABLE A-2: Reliability Results for Student Responses on The Effective School Battery 89

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The New York State Legislature provided approximately $23.5 million dollars to fund the Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) program in 1987-88, its fourth year of operation in the New York City public schools.

The purpose of the program was to identify students who were excessively absent, tardy, or otherwise "at risk" of dropping out of school, and to provide these students with services that would improve their attendance and academic achievement and encourage them to stay in school. Of this allocation, $9.8 million went to the Division of High Schools and $300,000 went to the Division of Special Education. The remaining $13.5 million went to the 32 Community School Districts (C.S.D.s) for the purpose of operating programs in 69 middle schools and 14 designated elementary schools. This evaluation report is concerned with the middle school A.I.D.P. programs.

The State Education Department (S.E.D.) first allocated funds for A.I.D.P. in 1984. Eligible schools were those having an average daily attendance rate at or below the citywide median of 85 percent.

In 1985-86, the Chancellor's office selected 68 middle schools having an average daily attendance rate that met the state-mandated criterion to participate in the program. The S.E.D. made a commitment to fund programs operating in these

schools for a period of three years. The Chancellor's office, in conjunction with the Office of Student Progress (O.S.P.), established guidelines for A.I.D.P. in 1985-86 that served as the foundation of the program in 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88. The guidelines stated that each middle school was to have the following components in place to provide services to A.I.D.P. students:

- Facilitation: A teacher was to serve as the site facilitator in order to identify and track the progress of students, coordinate program activities, collect and report data, and coordinate the Pupil Personnel Committee.

- Attendance: Each school was to develop outreach strategies to follow up on the absences of targeted students. These services were to supplement, not replace, daily attendance services and to focus on improving parent awareness of the child's poor attendance and the educational consequences that could result therefrom. Attendance incentives were to be used to augment these strategies.

- Guidance: Licensed or certified school counselors, social workers, or Substance Abuse Prevention Intervention Services (SAPIS) workers were to provide appropriate counseling to every targeted student in order to address problems that might contribute to poor attendance.

- Health: Schools were to work collaboratively with the New York City Health Department to provide diagnostic screening to all targeted students in physical, psychological, and educational areas that might affect attendance; to make referrals for follow-up services; and to ensure that these services were provided.

- School-Level Linkage: High schools were to work collaboratively with feeder middle schools to develop strategies to ease the transition from one school level to the next.

- Alternative Educational Programs: In 1985-86 and 1986-87, schools were to provide supplemental instruction to A.I.D.P. students in the form of career education classes held during the school day and optional small group enrichment activities held before or after school.

In 1987-88, the program continued to provide services within the six components. However, in response to recommendations made by school staff, O.S.P., and the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA), the Chancellor's guidelines delineated changes that were to be made in the implementation of the facilitation and alternative education components. They were as follows:

- Facilitation: The part-time facilitator position was made full-time to allow more time for the coordination of A.I.D.P. activities, staff supervision, and other facilitation tasks.

- Alternative Education Programs: Each participating school was to offer an alternative educational program to A.I.D.P. students during school hours. The program was to incorporate basic skills instruction in place of career education, and was to provide individualized attention to students, and transitional services to students returning to school after an extended period of absence. The program was to include a formal assessment of the instructional needs of students based on their performance on standardized tests, and appropriate placement into remedial or enrichment classes that were to be reduced in size and regularly scheduled, meeting at a minimum of three to five periods a week. It was to be paid for with P.C.E.N. funds or funds other than A.I.D.P. Extended school day activities, which could be instructional, career and vocational, guidance oriented, or recreational, became optional.

- Attendance Outreach and Guidance and Counseling Services: These program components were to remain the same except that additional emphasis was to be placed on parent outreach.

In addition to changes in the implementation of program components, the Chancellor's guidelines of 1987-88 delineated changes affecting school and student eligibility for the 1987-88 school year. Special education students were to be counted in school attendance statistics that determine a school's eligibility for the program and were to be included among the

students targeted for A.I.D.P. services. Once selected, they were to receive the full range of A.I.D.P. services equivalent to those the general education students received. Also, students previously in the A.I.D.P. program who no longer met the eligibility criterion for attendance would still be eligible for program services under certain conditions. Finally, students in sixth grade attending middle schools terminating in eighth grade would be eligible for A.I.D.P. services if all eligible seventh and eighth graders had been identified and were being served.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

The following minimum performance objectives were established by the Chancellor for the A.I.D.P. program in the middle schools:

- A minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with dropout prevention services will have 1987-88 attendance that is better than in 1986-87.
- A minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with dropout prevention services will pass at least one more subject in 1987-88 than they did in 1986-87. (This applies only to participating students who failed one or more subjects during the previous year.)
- Starting with 1985-86 as a baseline year, a minimum of 50 percent of the students, ninth grade or below, provided with dropout prevention services will still be in school three years later.
- A minimum of 50 percent of the middle school students provided with dropout services will be promoted to the next highest grade at the end of the school year.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

OREA had five objectives for the evaluation of the citywide A.I.D.P. program in the middle schools:

- to identify and describe students who received A.I.D.P. services;
- to examine the ways in which the implementation of school programs changed as a result of changes in the Chancellor's guidelines;
- to evaluate whether the program met the Chancellor's objectives;
- to examine the number and types of services that were delivered to A.I.D.P. students and their relationship to student outcomes; and
- to examine the relationship between school characteristics and climate and student outcomes.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

This evaluation focuses on two issues: the relationship between the overall implementation of the A.I.D.P. program and the attendance and achievement outcomes of the student participants across the city; and the differences between A.I.D.P. schools which affect student outcomes. The evaluation presents data on the citywide A.I.D.P. student population as well as on the population of a sample of 18 A.I.D.P. schools. Data concerning each of these populations were obtained from several sources. Using files maintained by the Office of Educational Data Services (O.E.D.S.), OREA examined student attendance and achievement data for the entire A.I.D.P. population. In addition, OREA staff retrieved and analyzed data from the Monthly Summary of Services Reports (M.S.S.R.s) maintained on every student by school-based program facilitators and collected by the Office of Student Progress (O.S.P.), regarding the characteristics of the students in the program and the number and types of services these students received.

The second focus of this report grew out of the previous years' observation that an individual school program's success in improving the attendance of its students appeared to be only partially related to the number and types of A.I.D.P. services its students received. OREA evaluators hypothesized that the school context in which the programs operated played as great a role in determining program success as the degree to which the individual programs adhered to the Chancellor's guidelines. Consequently, as part of this evaluation, OREA took a closer look at such factors as school climate, school characteristics, and degrees of and variation in program implementation in 18 schools that had experienced varying levels of success in improving the attendance of their A.I.D.P. students. The sample was chosen as follows:

Using outcome data from 1986-87, the 68 middle school A.I.D.P. programs from that year were ranked and categorized according to the percentage of A.I.D.P. students in each school who increased their attendance.* Schools in the top range were considered to be those in which over 58 percent of the A.I.D.P. students showed an improvement in attendance. Students in the middle range demonstrated percentages ranging from 47.0 to 58.0. Finally, schools considered to be the least successful were those

---

*The criterion of the percentage of students whose attendance improved was used rather than overall mean attendance rate because of the wording of the Chancellor's objective. Schools in which a higher percentage of students improved their attendance were not necessarily the same as schools with a higher overall mean attendance rate.

in which the percentage of improving students was lower than 47 percent. Six schools from each of these categories were randomly selected to provide a cross section of schools for in-depth study, with the assumption that these schools would remain in the same position in the spectrum of success in 1987-88.

OREA staff interviewed facilitators and principals at these schools in order to gain a fuller understanding of how the programs were implemented and integrated within the school. They were also asked general questions about the school and neighborhood environment, the student body, staff, and other school resources. In addition, in order to assess school climate in a standardized way from the point of view of school participants, OREA evaluators selected a random sample of ten teachers (including A.I.D.P. and non-A.I.D.P. teachers) and four classes of students representative of each sample school to complete a modified version of the school climate scales of the Effective School Battery (E.S.B).* (See Appendix A for information concerning the modification and validity of the E.S.B.).

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Chapter I of this report provides an overview of the A.I.D.P. program, focusing on changes in the Chancellor's guidelines for program implementation. It also addresses the

---

*Adapted and reproduced by special permission of the publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16102 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, Florida 33549, from the Effective School Battery by Gary D. Gottfredson, Ph.D., Copyright 1985. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission from PAR, Inc.

evaluation objectives and procedures and contains a brief description of the databases used.

Chapter II of the report provides citywide outcome data, and includes a description of the A.I.D.P. student population and the range and frequency of the services offered to them. Finally, this section presents data on the attendance and achievement of students who participated in the program, and examines the relationship between overall program implementation and outcomes.

Chapter III of this report includes a review of literature on school climate and context, and the relationship of these environmental elements to student attendance and achievement. The chapter describes contextual differences between schools in the random sample with emphasis on factors cited in the literature as important. It also examines how A.I.D.P. programs operated in individual schools, and distinguishes differences in service delivery. Information on school climate is based on staff and student responses to the Effective School Battery and interviews with A.I.D.P. facilitators and school principals. Information on demographics, building conditions, school resources, staff and student characteristics, and other contextual differences was retrieved from sources within the Central Board of Education. Data concerning A.I.D.P. service delivery were obtained from the M.S.S.R.s.

Chapter IV presents an analyis of student outcomes in relation to context, climate, and program variables discussed in Chapter III, emphasizing those factors that appear to promote

better student attendance and academic achievement.

Chapters V and VI, respectively, present conclusions concerning the implementation and effectiveness of the A.I.D.P. program within the school context, and recommendations aimed at enhancing program success.

II. SUMMARY OF CITYWIDE PROGRAM

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Student Selection

Each A.I.D.P. school was to serve at least 150 students whose records indicated excessive absences and poor academic functioning. The selection criteria to be used in the middle schools to target A.I.D.P. students can be found in Table 1. All of the criteria were to apply to students in special education as well as to those in general education.

According to changes in the Chancellor's guidelines in 1987-88, special education students were to be counted in determining a school's eligibility for the program and were to be included among the students targeted for A.I.D.P. services. (In the past, students in special education had received A.I.D.P. services through a special education A.I.D.P. program.) Schools that served fewer than 150 at-risk students from the general education population in 1986-87 were given funds by the districts to make up the difference with special education students who met the attendance criteria. Hence, if a program had ten vacancies in 1986-87, that program was funded for ten special education students. However, even if that same program had filled the 150 slots with general education students in 1987-88, it was still obliged to provide services to the ten additional special education students. Conversely, a program only had to serve the number of special education students for whom it was funded,

Table 1

Number and Percent of A.I.D.P. Students
Selected by Criterion

Selection Criteria	(n)	Percent of Target Population (N=9376*)
30 to 74 Absences in 1986-87	4439	47.3
15 to 37 Absences in spring, 1987	1341	14.3
25 to 29 Absences in 1986-87 and		
- Participant in 1986-87 A.I.D.P./ D.P.P. Program	58	0.6
- 1987 D.R.P. score at or below the 35th percentile	286	3.1
- Failure in two or more major subjects in June, 1987	84	0.9
- 20 or more days late in 1986-87	126	1.3
- Two or more years overage for grade	26	0.3
- 20 or more half-day absences in 1986-87	2	0.0
- LEP-entitled	8	0.1
22 to 25 Absences in 1986-87 and participant in 1986-87 A.I.D.P./D.P.P. program	71	0.8
Absent fewer than 25 times in 1986-87 but meets two of the criteria listed below: - 1987 D.R.P. score at or below the 35th percentile - 1987 Gates eligible - two or more subject failures in June, 1987 - student in temporary housing - 20 or more days late in 1986-87 - two or more years overage for grade - LEP-entitled	628	6.8
L.T.A. in 1986-87, but in school 10 or more days between September and October 31, 1987	46	0.5
Absent 10 or more days between September and Octber 31, 1987, but not L.T.A. or No-Show	119	1.3
15 to 37 absences from September, 1987 to January, 1988	349	3.7
12 to 14 Absences from September, 1987 to January, 1988 and two or more major subject failures in the second marking period	48	0.5
School-based determination of eligibility	1725	18.4
Participated in A.I.D.P./D.P.P. program in 1986-87 (Transitional)	20	0.2

*Eligibility Criterion data missing for 2387 students.

whether or not there were other eligible special education students in the school in 1987-88.

Criteria for student selection were to be used for the two upper grades of middle school in order of their presentation in the guidelines: that is, the second criterion could be used only when all students who fit the first criterion had been selected, and there was still space remaining in the program.

If there were still openings available, junior high school students in grade six could be selected, applying the same criteria in order of their presentation. Those students previously in the A.I.D.P. program who no longer met the eligibility criteria for attendance could also be selected for program services under certain conditions.

Student Characteristics

The A.I.D.P. middle school program served approximately 11,765 students across the city. The largest percentage of students were in the eighth grade (4,077 or 34.7 percent), followed by those in seventh grade (3733 students, or 32 percent of the total population). The remaining 1,521 ninth graders comprised 13 percent of the total population. Although schools could include sixth grade students who met the eligibility criteria, only 659 (5.6 percent) of these students were served. There were 1,168 special education students in the program, comprising nearly ten percent of the population.

Another group of students included in the program were students in temporary housing (S.T.H.s) who met the attendance

criteria. Citywide, this group included 202 students, comprising less than two percent of the program population.

Overall, 22.7 percent of the students had been in the program the previous year. There were 9.2 percent more males than females. Seventeen percent of the students were overage for their grade. Slightly fewer than seven percent of the students (777) were limited English proficient (LEP).

PROGRAM IMPLÉMENTATION

This section of the report presents the frequency and range of services students actually received during the course of the year. In general, the data are presented in aggregate form. However, for the purpose of comparing service delivery in 1987-88 to that of the previous year, OREA used only data from the sample schools instead of citywide data, because M.S.S.R. data were available only for these schools.

Description of Services

As in 1986-87, the following six components were required of each school-based dropout prevention program:

- facilitating services to students;
- attendance outreach;
- guidance and counseling;
- health services;
- school-level linkage; and
- alternative educational programs.

Students were to receive services in all six components.

Range and Frequency of Program Services

OREA staff obtained information regarding the range and frequency of A.I.D.P. services provided to students in 1987-88 from the Monthly Summary of Service Reports (M.S.S.R.s) filled out by school facilitators for each A.I.D.P. student. For the purposes of this evaluation, all students for whom no services were reported or who were discharged from the program during the first three months were eliminated from the analyses, leaving a total of 11,765 students citywide. Table 2 shows that most students were in the program for a full ten months.

OREA collected information on five categories of A.I.D.P.-funded service designed to encourage attendance. They were the following: attendance outreach, guidance services, attendance incentives, high school linkage activities, and extended school-day activities, which included high-interest activities scheduled either before or after school and could include instruction, recreation, guidance, or some combination of the three.

Per-student data on facilitation were not available because of the component's administrative nature. It is assumed that each student who received any program services received the direct or indirect services of the facilitator.

Almost all A.I.D.P. students received services in the attendance outreach category (99.2 percent). Eighty-five percent of the students received services in the guidance category. Sixty-one percent received attendance incentives. Thirty-seven percent participated in high school linkage activities. The

TABLE 2

Number of Months in Program
(N=11,765)

Months	Number of Students	Percent
3	128	1.1
4	412	3.5
5	485	4.1
6	357	3.0
7	414	3.5
8	573	4.9
9	1,198	10.2
10	8,198	69.7
Total	11,765	100.0

- Nearly 70 percent of all A.I.D.P. students were in the program for a full ten months.

smallest percentage of students received extended school-day activities (35.1 percent). (See Table 3.)

Within the category of attendance outreach, students could receive as many as six types of services. (See Table 4.) Most students (33.0 percent) received a combination of four services in this area. Over 80 percent of the program students received at least one mail contact, phone contact, or home visit.

Within the category of guidance and counseling, students could receive up to three services. (See Table 5.) These included individual sessions, group sessions, and parent sessions. Most students (40.6 percent) received two of the three types of services. While almost three-quarters of the students received individual guidance sessions, only 28 percent of the students' parents participated in guidance sessions. Table 6 shows that out of a possible 12 A.I.D.P.-funded services, including all services within the categories of attendance and guidance as well as incentives, extended-day activities, and high school linkages, most students (66 percent) received from five to eight services.

As stated in the Chancellor's guidelines, A.I.D.P. students were to receive alternative instructional services during the school day. These services were to be either in the form of remedial classes in reading, writing, or mathematics, or in the form of enrichment activities such as career education. Table 7 shows that 5,771 students (49 percent) received alternative education services. Students could participate in one or more

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Students
Who Received A.I.D.P Services
(N=11,765)

Service Category	Number of Students	Percent
Attendance Services	11,667	99.2
Guidance Services	10,000	85.0
Attendance Incentives	7,171	61.0
High School Linkage	4,349	37.0
Extended School Day	4,133	35.1

·Almost all the A.I.D.P students received attendance services.

TABLE 4

Number and Percent
of Students Receiving Attendance
Outreach Services
(N=11,765)

Service	Number of Students	Percent
Total Receiving Attendance Services	11,667*	99.2
Mail Contact	10,238	87.0
Phone Contact	10,007	85.1
Home Visits	9,499	80.7
School/Student Attendance Conference	6,139	52.0
School/Parent Attendance Conference	3,604	30.6
Autodialer Contact	3,027	25.7

*Number is less than column total because students could receive more than one attendance service.

•More than three-quarters of the A.I.D.P. students received mail contacts, phone contacts, and home visits.

TABLE 5

Number and Percent of Students
Who Received A.I.D.P
Guidance Services
(N=11,765)

Service Category	Number of Students	Percent
Total receiving Guidance Services	10,000*	85.0
Individual Guidance Sessions	8,686	73.8
Group Guidance Sessions	7,414	63.0
Parent Guidance Sessions	3,298	28.0

*Numbers exceed total in column because students could receive more than one guidance service.

·Almost three-quarters of the A.I.D.P. students received individual guidance sessions.

TABLE 6

Number and Percent of
A.I.D.P. SERVICES
Students Received During 1987-88
(N=11,765)

Number of Services	Number of Students	Percent
1	152	1.3
2	314	2.7
3	521	4.4
4	871	7.4
5	1,479	12.6
6	2,068	17.6
7	2,307	19.6
8	1,886	16.0
9	1,256	10.7
10	656	5.6
11	226	1.9
12	29	0.2

- The services students received included mail contacts, personal phone contacts, autodial contacts, home visits, school/student attendance conferences, school/parent attendance conferences, personal guidance sessions, parent guidance sessions, group guidance sessions, attendance incentives, extended day programs, and high school linkage.

- Most students received between six and eight services (53.2 percent), with the largest percentage (19.6) receiving seven services. Less than one percent of the students received all 12 services.

TABLE 7

Alternative Education Services
Students Received
(N=11765)

	Students Receiving Services	
	Number	Percent
Alternative Education Services	5,771*	49.1
Remedial Education	4,288*	36.5
Reading	1,717	14.6
Math	2,417	20.5
Writing	1,019	8.7
Enrichment	2,561*	21.8
Career Education	1,370	11.6
Other A.I.D.P Enrichment	1,279	10.9

*Number is less than column total because students could receive more than one service within each component.

•Nearly half of the A.I.D.P. students received alternative education services. Of those who did receive service, the majority received remediation.

types of activities, but nearly 75 percent of those served by this component, or 37 percent of the total A.I.D.P population, received alternative educational services in only one category. The majority of students received remediation, with the largest group receiving remedial mathematics. Fewer than 22 percent of the students received enrichment classes.

A Comparison of Service Contacts in 1986-87 and 1987-88

The average number of attendance and guidance contacts provided to A.I.D.P. students who received services in those categories in 1987-88 was compared to the average number provided to students in 1986-87, using information obtained from the M.S.S.R.s for the randomly selected sample schools in each year.

Although it should be noted that sampling was different, it appeared that overall, there was an increase in the average number of contacts students received in all but one area of attendance outreach in 1987-88, when compared to the number students had received the previous year. The greatest increases occurred in the areas of personal phone calls and mailings. (See Table 8.) The percentage of students who received home visits also increased substantially in 1987-88. The area of automated phone calls to the homes of students was the only attendance outreach service that was provided to fewer students overall in 1987-88 than in the previous year.

When guidance services were compared, it was found that both the average number of individual sessions per year and the average number of group sessions in which a student participated

TABLE 8

A Comparison of 1986-87 and 1987-88
Attendance Outreach Contacts Received
by A.I.D.P. Students

Service	Mean Number Of Service Contacts 1986-87 (N=2,491)[a]	1987-88 (N=3,197)[b]	Difference
Mail Contact	3.8	6.1	2.3
Telephone Contact	7.3	10.1	2.8
Autodialer	5.9	1.5	-4.4
Home Visits	1.7	4.0	2.3
School/Parent Conference	0.5	0.6	0.1
School/Student Conference	2.2	2.2	0.0

[a]Data are based on the number of students for whom M.S.S.R. data was available in 15 sample A.I.D.P. schools.

[b]Data are based on the number of students for whom M.S.S.R. data was available in 18 sample schools.

- The mean number of service contacts students received was higher in all but two attendance categories in 1987-88 than in the previous year. The largest increase was in the number of telephone calls students received.

were lower in 1987-88 than in 1986-87. The M.S.S.R.s in 1987-88 indicated that A.I.D.P. students' parents participated in an average of 0.6 parent guidance sessions; but since data from the previous year were unavailable for this category, there was no basis for comparison. (See Table 9.)

CITYWIDE PROGRAM OUTCOMES

This section assesses the impact of the A.I.D.P. program on attendance rates (percent of days on register that a student has attended class), and academic achievement (measured by the course pass rate and changes in reading and mathematics scores on standardized achievement tests). The changes in student attendance and academic achievement in relation to student and program variables are examined. O.E.D.S. student databases and M.S.S.R.s provided the data for this examination.

The following analyses are based on data for all the A.I.D.P. students from 69 schools whose names appeared on M.S.S.R.s (11,765), except those who either received no program service, or who were discharged during the first three months of the program. The services either of these groups may have received were considered insufficient to have analytic value.

CHANGES IN A.I.D.P. STUDENT ATTENDANCE FROM 1986-87 TO 1987-88

Performance Objective

Chancellor's Special Circular Number 37 established the following objective for student attendance for the 1987-88 A.I.D.P. program:

- a minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with

TABLE 9

A Comparison of 1986-87 and 1987-88
Guidance Service Contacts Received
by A.I.D.P. Students

Service	Mean Number Of Service Contacts 1986-87 (N=2,491)[a]	1987-88 (N=3,197)[b]	Difference
Individual Sessions	3.5	2.9	-0.6
Group Sessions	4.7	2.7	-2.0
Parent Sessions	-	0.6	-

[a]Data are based on the number of students for whom M.S.S.R. data were available for a randomly selected sample of 15 schools in 1986-87.

[b]Data are based on the number of students for whom M.S.S.R. data were available for a stratified random sample of 18 schools in 1987-88.

- The mean percentage of individual guidance sessions and group guidance sessions was less in 1987-88 than in 1986-87.
- Students' parents in 1987-88 received an average of 0.6 parent guidance sessions. No data for this service were available for 1986-1987.

dropout prevention services will have 1987-88 attendance that is better than in 1986-87.

Citywide data from O.E.D.S. show that while the program approached this objective, with an improvement in attendance rate of 47.7 percentage of the students, it did not quite meet it. Further, the proportion of students whose attendance improved was 4.1 percentage points lower than the proportion of the previous year's students whose attendance improved (51.8). Not surprisingly, the mean attendance rate for the present year's program students also declined from 79.0 in 1986-87 to 76.9 in 1987-88--a drop of 2.1 points. (See Table 10).

Attendance Outcomes by School

Of the 69 A.I.D.P. schools, 25 achieved the Chancellor's objective of at least 50 percent of the program students increasing their attendance. The highest single percentage of program students in any school that showed an increase in attendance was 74.0 and the lowest was 25.7. In 19 schools, the mean attendance rate of programs students increased; in one, it stayed the same; and in 49, it decreased. Of the 25 schools in which the attendance objective was met, 19 also showed an increase in the mean attendance rate of program students; but in six schools in which the objective was met, the mean A.I.D.P. attendance rate decreased.

CHANGES IN A.I.D.P. STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FROM 1986-87 TO 1987-88

Performance Objectives

The Chancellor established the following objectives for

Table 10

Overall Attendance Rate of A.I.D.P. Students in 1986-87 and 1987-88[a]

	Number of Students[b]	Mean	Percent Improved
1986-87		79.0	
	8,278		47.7
1987-88		76.9	

[a]Attendance rate indicates the percent of days on register that a student attended class.

[b]This analysis includes only students for whom both 1986-1987 and 1987-88 attendance data were available.

- The attendance rate of A.I.D.P. students overall declined 2.1 percentage points from 1986-87 to 1987-88.
- Overall, the A.I.D.P. population fell just short of the program objective stipulating that 50 percent of the students would improve their attendance during the program year.

- a minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with dropout prevention services will pass at least one more subject in 1987-88 than they did in 1986-87. (This applies only to those students who failed one or more subjects in 1986-87.)
- a minimum of 50 percent of the middle school students provided with dropout services will be promoted to the next highest grade at the end of the school year.

Because the number and type of classes offered in middle schools vary from school to school and from grade level to grade level within schools, OREA used the course pass rate, calculated as the number of courses passed over the number of courses taken, as a means of comparison between the two years. In terms of course pass rates, the data show that the program met and exceeded the Chancellor's objective--65.6 percent of the students who failed at least one subject in 1986-87 increased their pass rate in 1987-88, representing an increase of 12.6 percent over the previous year. The overall mean pass rate for program students increased from 70.4 to 71.2 percent, a gain of 0.8 points. (See Table 11.)

The A.I.D.P. program also met and exceeded the second objective for achievement. Only 1,095 or 9.3 percent of the program students were projected as holdovers. Interestingly, 61 percent of these students were male, while only 39 percent were female.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTCOMES AND STUDENT VARIABLES

Attendance and achievement outcomes by grade and student subgroup are presented in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 11

Academic Outcomes of A.I.D.P.
Students in 1986-87 and 1987-88

Mean Course Pass Rate		Percent Achieving Criterion[b]	Percent Promoted to Next Grade
1986-87	1987-88[a]		
70.4	71.2	65.6	90.7

[a] This analysis refers only to students for whom both 1986-87 and 1987-88 course pass rates were available (n=7,442).

[b] Percent of students who failed at least one course in 1986-87 whose course pass rate improved in 1987-88.

- The course pass rate of A.I.D.P. students overall increased by 0.8 percentage points from 1986-87 to 1987-88.
- The A.I.D.P. program met and exceeded the objective stipulating that 50 percent of the A.I.D.P. students who failed at least one course in 1986-87 would improve their course pass rate during the program year.
- The A.I.D.P. program students exceeded the objective stipulating that 50 percent of its students would be promoted to the next highest grade.

Student Outcomes by Grade Level

Analyses indicate that the percentage of students in each grade whose attendance rate increased from 1986-87 to 1987-88 declined somewhat as the grade level increased, with the largest drop in the ninth grade. Only the sixth grade met the Chancellor's objective for attendance, although the seventh and eighth grades came very close to achieving it. Generally, attendance rates also declined slightly as grade level increased. The mean attendance of sixth graders overall declined 1.5 percentage points, while that of ninth graders declined by 2.1 percentage points. (See Table 12.)

Table 13 shows that in each grade, over 50 percent of the program students who failed at least one course in 1986-87 increased their course pass rate in 1987-88, thus meeting the Chancellor's objective. However, it is worth noting that although these program students improved their course pass rate, in the seventh grade another group of students did less well than they had previously, causing the mean course pass rate of seventh grade program students overall to decline. A.I.D.P. students in all grades showed gains on the D.R.P. and MAT mathematics tests. The mean D.R.P. scores for both years by grade level show that seventh grade program students had the largest gain (5.1 points) bringing them from the 19th to the 30th percentile, while students in the sixth grade had an increase of only 1.9 points, from the 16th to the 21st percentile, a smaller gain than would be expected over a year's time. The gain in eighth grade

TABLE 12

A.I.D.P. Student Subgroups and Attendance Outcomes[a]

Student Group	Percent who Improved Attendance	Overall Attendance Rate		
		1986-87 Mean	1987-88 Mean	Difference
Grade 6 N=659	50.4	78.4 (n=123)	76.9	-1.5
Grade 7 N=3,733	49.6	79.2 (n=2,220)	77.9	-1.3
Grade 8 N=4,077	49.2	79.6 (n=3,463)	77.9	-1.7
Grade 9 N=1,521	46.2	79.7 (n=1,297)	77.6	-2.1
Total Student Population N=11,765[b]	47.7	79.0 (n=8,278)[c]	76.9	-2.1
Subgroups				
Special Education N=1,168	41.3	76.2 (n=829)	72.1	-4.1
Students in Temporary Housing N=202	37.4	72.5 (n=131)	67.2	-5.3
LEP Students N=777	48.0	80.8 (n=558)	78.7	-2.1

[a]This analysis includes only students for whom both 1986-1987 and 1987-88 attendance data were available.

[b]N=Number of students in each grade/category.

[c]N=Number of students in the analysis.

Table 11

A.I.D.P. Student Subgroups and Achievement Outcomes[a]

Student Group	Percent Who Met Program Objective For Pass Rate[b]	OVERALL COURSE PASS RATE 1986-87 Mean	1987-88 Mean	Difference	D.R.P. UNIT SCORES 1986-87 Mean	1987-88 Mean	Difference	MAT SCALE SCORES 1986-87 Mean	1987-88 Mean	Difference
Grade 6 N=659	61.0 (n=341)	67.6	68.4 (n=537)	0.8	48.0	49.9 (n=555)	1.9	613.6	622.8 (n=550)	9.2
Grade 7 N=3,733	57.6 (n=1,728)	68.1	67.0 (n=2,678)	-1.1	50.5	55.6 (n=3,021)	5.1	624.2	631.0 (n=2,920)	6.8
Grade 8 N=4,077	59.5 (n=1,496)	72.5	74.2 (n=2,379)	1.8	57.6	61.8 (n=3,261)	4.2	633.2	644.1 (n=3,107)	10.9
Grade 9 N=1,521	63.6 (n=434)	75.4	78.0 (n=700)	2.6	62.0	65.3 (n=1,256)	3.3	644.5	654.2 (n = 980)	9.6
Total A.I.D.P. Student Population N=11,765	65.6 (n=4,683)	70.4	71.2 (n=7,442)	0.8	53.5	57.6 (n=9,311)	4.1	626.2	635.5 (n=8,627)	9.3
Subgroups[c]										
Special Education N=1,168	66.2 (n=482)	69.3	73.9 (n=806)	4.6	41.1	44.7 (n=835)	3.6	594.6	606.6 (n=736)	12.0
Students In Temporary Housing N=202	53.5 (n=71)	65.8	62.9 (n=100)	-2.9	51.8	55.2 (n=131)	3.4	622.8	629.4 (n=113)	6.6
LEP Students N=777	66.3 (n=306)	70.3	76.5 (n=494)	6.2	37.8	43.0 (n=439)	5.3	594.5	613.3 (n=438)	18.8

[a]These analyses include only students for whom both 1986-87 and 1987-88 data were available.

[b]Percent of students who failed at least one course in 1986-87 and who improved their course pass rate in 1987-88.

[c]Special Education students are ungraded, and the numbers of students in the S.T.H. and LEP subgroups are small, precluding grade analyses. Therefore the summary data for the A.I.D.P. students overall and for the subgroups are provided as a global comparison of achievement gains, and should be read with that caveat in mind.

students' mean D.R.P. scores brought them from the 27th to the 37th percentile while the gain in mean D.R.P. scores for ninth graders brought them from the 34th to the 42nd percentile. MAT mathematics scores increased 9.3 points overall from 626.2 to 635.5. (See Table 13).

A.I.D.P. Students in Special Education

Of the 1,168 special education students, 41.3 percent increased their attendance rate, falling short of the Chancellor's objective. (See Table 12.) The mean attendance rate for this group dropped 4.1 points, from 76.2 percent in 1986-87 to 72.1 percent to 1987-88.

Nearly two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the program students in special education who had failed at least one course in 1986-87 had an increase in course pass rate, exceeding the Chancellor's objective by 16.2 percentage points. The course pass rate for special education students overall also increased over the two years by 4.6 percentage points, from 69.3 to 73.9. The mean D.R.P. scores for this group rose 3.6 points, from 41.1 to 44.7. Their mean MAT mathematics scores also increased 12 points, from a mean of 594.0 to 606.6.*

A.I.D.P. Students in Temporary Housing

Of the 202 program students in temporary housing, 37.4 percent increased their attendance, falling short of the

---

*Special education students are ungraded, and the numbers of students in the S.T.H. and LEP subgroups are small, precluding grade analyses. Therefore the summary data for the subgroups of A.I.D.P. students are provided as a global comparison of achievement gains, and should be read with that caveat in mind.

Chancellor's objective by 12.6 points. The overall attendance rate of this group declined 5.3 points, from a mean percentage of 72.5 to 67.2 from 1986-87 to 1987-88.

In terms of academic achievement, 53.5 percent of A.I.D.P. students in temporary housing had an increase in their course pass rate, just meeting the Chancellor's objective. However, course pass rate for the group as a whole declined 2.9 percentage points, from 65.8 to 62.9. The mean D.R.P. scores for this group rose 3.4 points, from 1986-87 to 1987-88 from 51.8 to 55.2 percent. The mean MAT mathematics scores increased from 622.8 to 629.4 percent--a gain of 6.6 points.

LEP Students in A.I.D.P.

The 777 LEP students in the program had attendance outcomes roughly on par with A.I.D.P. students as a whole: 48 percent increased their attendance, nearly meeting the Chancellor's objective. Attendance rates for this group dropped 2.1 points, from 80.8 percent in 1986-87 to 78.7 percent in 1988.

Academic achievement outcomes for this group were mixed when compared with the A.I.D.P. students as a whole. Two-thirds of the LEP A.I.D.P. students had an increase in their course pass rate--a higher percentage than the citywide A.I.D.P. group. The course pass rate for the group overall also increased 6.2 points, from 70.3 to 76.5. This was the largest increase in course pass rates for any student group. Overall mean test scores on the D.R.P., however, were lower for this group than for the citywide group. They achieved a gain of 5.3 percentage points, from 37.8

to 43.0, from 1986-87 to 1987-88. The mean MAT scores for this group increased 18.8 percentage points from 594.5 to 613.3 over the two-year period.

Comparison with Non-served A.I.D.P.-Eligible Students

OREA compared attendance outcomes of A.I.D.P. students who had been selected on the basis of their 1986-87 attendance (using the first two of the Chancellor's criteria) with the outcomes of a sample of students from grades six through nine who were eligible for A.I.D.P. on the basis of their 1986-87 attendance (as noted above) but were either in schools that had no program or were not selected for participation (n=7,459).* Analyses of the median attendance rates for these two groups show that while they were comparable in 1986-87, the A.I.D.P. group improved slightly over the program year (1.5 percent) but the comparison group declined slightly (0.9 percent). (See Table 14.) In addition, the percentage of students who improved their attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88 was higher for the A.I.D.P group (52.4 percent) than for the comparison group (48.7 percent).

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM VARIABLES AND ATTENDANCE

As stated in the Chancellor's memo, A.I.D.P. students were to receive A.I.D.P.-funded services to encourage attendance, as well as alternative education services during the school day to supplement their education. Students could receive up to 12

---

*In order to be included in this analysis, students had to have attendance data for both 1986-87 and 1987-88.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Attendance Rates for the 1987-88
Middle School A.I.D.P. Students and
Attendance-Eligible, Non-Served Middle School Students[a]

	Number of Students	1986-87 Median	1987-88 Median	Difference
A.I.D.P. Students[b]	4,166	78.9	80.4	1.5
Comparison Group[c]	7,459	78.2	77.3	-0.9

[a] Only students for whom attendance data were available for both 1986-87 and 1987-88 were included in this analysis.

[b] Only students who met A.I.D.P. attendance criteria in 1986-87 were included in this analysis.

[c] The comparison group consisted of students citywide who met the A.I.D.P. attendance criteria in 1986-87, but were not served by the program.

- Although both groups had similar median attendance rates in 1986-87, the A.I.D.P. students improved slightly and the comparison group declined slightly in 1987-88.

TABLE 15

Relationship between Multiple A.I.D.P. and Alternative Education Services and Attendance Change

1 Number of A.I.D.P. Services Received	2 Number of Students Receiving A.I.D.P. Service(s)	3 Percent of Students Also Receiving Alternative Ed*		4 Difference in Mean Attendance Rate of Students In Column 2
		N	Percent	
One:	152	7	4.6	-6.1
Two:	314	49	15.6	-8.0
Three:	521	133	25.5	-6.1
Four:	871	263	30.2	-5.0
Five:	1479	558	37.7	-3.0
Six:	2068	951	46.0	-2.0
Seven:	2307	1198	51.9	-1.2
Eight:	1886	1144	60.7	-1.2
Nine:	1256	827	65.8	-1.2
Ten:	656	463	70.6	-0.8
Eleven	226	155	68.6	-1.0
Twelve	29	23	79.3	-3.0

A.I.D.P. services and as many as five alternative education services. Table 15 shows that students who received only one, two, or three A.I.D.P. services declined in their mean attendance more percentage points than those students who received seven to eleven A.I.D.P. services. (See Table 15.) It also appears that a majority of the students who received multiple A.I.D.P. services, and who also received at least one alternative education service, showed the smallest decrease in mean attendance. (See far right hand column of Table 15.) This finding lends support to the idea that additional educational efforts are also necessary to increase and maintain student attendance.

In summary, in 1987-88, the A.I.D.P. program overall approached but fell short of the attendance objectives set forth by the Chancellor, with nearly 48 percent of the program students citywide improving their attendance. When A.I.D.P. students selected on the basis of attendance criteria primarily were compared with citywide students who met the same criteria but who were not served by the program, the median attendance of the program group showed an improvement between 1987 and 1988 while that of the citywide group declined. The program met and exceeded the Chancellor's objectives for academic achievement: those students who failed at least one course in 1986-87 increased their course pass rate by 12.6 percent. In addition, the pass rate of A.I.D.P. students citywide increased 0.8 percentage points; and fewer than ten percent of the A.I.D.P. students were projected as holdovers in the spring of 1988.

students were projected as holdovers in the spring of 1988.

In terms of student-related variables, citywide statistics show that of all the subgroups of A.I.D.P. students, those in temporary housing had the least success in increasing their attendance. In terms of program-related variables, statistics indicate that those A.I.D.P students who received both attendance-related and instructional services tended to have more success in improving their attendance.

Citywide statistics show that of all the subgroups of A.I.D.P. students, those in temporary housing had the least success in increasing their attendance. Data also indicate that students receiving both attendance-related and instructional services tended to have more success in improving attendance.

While this chapter provides an overview of student outcomes for the A.I.D.P. program in terms of implementation and student variables, its level of analysis does not take into account outcome differences in relation to the mean number of service contacts within each category each student actually received. In the following chapters these and other differences in service delivery, as well as differences in school climate and student characteristics, are presented and analyzed in relation to student outcomes.

III. INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL CONTEXT

In this and previous years, OREA found that when attendance and achievement data for all A.I.D.P. middle schools were analyzed in the aggregate, no gains were made. However, gains have clearly been made in some schools and not in others. (See Tables 16 and 17.) In the third year of operation of the A.I.D.P. program, OREA asked the following questions: Why have some schools had greater success than others in raising attendance and achievement of A.I.D.P. students? Are the differences in program effectiveness attributable to variations in program implementation, or are outcomes influenced by other factors in the schools in which A.I.D.P. programs operate?

This chapter presents the sample of 18 schools that were selected for this evaluation in terms of their student outcomes, the implementation of their A.I.D.P. programs, their demographics, and other factors influencing school climate. It begins with a review of literature focusing on school climate characteristics found to be associated with overall school effectiveness, and the instruments designed to measure these characteristics. It is from this literature that school context questions were derived.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept and Characteristics of School Climate

As educational researchers and administrators have sought

ways in which schools might be more effective in training and retaining an increasingly diverse student population, they have focused much attention on the concept of school climate. School climate has been variously defined but, for the purposes of this report, encompasses those aspects of the school environment that have an impact upon its participants (students, teachers and administrators) and which, theoretically, can be altered. (This is in contrast to those aspects of the student body that cannot be altered, such as students' background, family history, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.)* This report focuses on aspects thought to be related to student behavior, attendance, and academic achievement.

As described by Carolyn S. Anderson in her comprehensive review of school climate literature (Anderson, 1982), school climate research has evolved from the twin sources of organizational climate and school effects research.

Taguiri (1968) devised a taxonomy for the study of organizational climate. According to him, its dimensions include its ecology (physical and material aspects), its milieu (the social dimension concerned with the presence of persons and groups), and its social system (the social dimension concerned with belief systems, values, cognitive structures, and meaning).

School Climate and Effective Schools

Educational researchers have looked at school climate to

*It should be noted, however, that these "unalterable" student characteristics have been found to have an impact on staff expectations of students and staff morale (Pallas, 1987).

measure school effectiveness. School effects research is strongly associated with the work of the late Dr. Ronald R. Edmonds, who defined effective schools as those that "bring the children of the poor to those minimal masteries of basic school skills that now describe minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class" (Edmonds, 1982). He isolated the following characteristics as being indispensable to effective schools:

- strong administrative leadership;
- an atmosphere of high teacher expectation of students in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement;
- a safe, orderly, quiet atmosphere;
- a school-wide policy that pupil acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities;
- a system of frequent monitoring of pupil progress and the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis of program evaluation. (Edmonds, 1982).

Other researchers have made findings that essentially support these characteristics of effective schools.

Administrative Characteristics. The role of the principal and the relationship between the school administration and the faculty were found to have an impact on climate and school effectiveness. In improving schools, the principal was more likely to be an instructional leader as well as a manager (Brookover and Lezotte, 1979). Bell (1979) observed that the isolation of teachers and the absence of "collegiality" between faculty and administration was the prevailing characteristic leading to a "climate of crisis" in many urban schools.

Teachers' perceptions of principals as hindering them in their work (giving them additional tasks, etc.) correlate significantly with lower student achievement (Miller, 1968); Feldvebel, 1964a,b; Maxwell, 1967). Ellet and Walberg (1979) found a relationship between staff participation in decision making and student achievement. Wynn (1980) found that a positive school spirit was associated with the amount of socialization among faculty.

Student Issues. Rutter et al. (1979) reported that the extent of opportunities students have for participation in school activities is related to achievement. In the same study, it was found that rewards and praise were frequent and public in high-achieving schools.

Parent Issues. The relationship between parents and school administrators and teachers has been linked to school climate and student achievement (The Phi Delta Kappa Study, 1980). However, according to Brookover and Lezotte (1979), high student achievement was correlated with parent-initiated rather than school-initiated parent involvement, suggesting that effective parent involvement may be difficult for schools alone to manipulate.

Building Characteristics. Rutter et al. (1979) found that the age of a school building did not seem to be very important, but that the decoration and care of the building seemed to have a high correlation with student achievement.

Size. Rutter et al. (1979) reported that class size or

school size generally had no effect on student outcomes. However, findings of some studies suggest a difference for at-risk students with respect to this variable. Duke and Perry (1978), in a descriptive study of 18 schools, concluded that smaller schools showed better student behavior. Smaller elementary schools were perceived by students as friendlier and more cohesive (Sinclair, 1970).

Climate Instruments

Attempts to assess school climate have been made using such "objective" data as social composition, ability composition, and school size, as well as direct observations made by outside researchers, and subjective data as reported by school participants. There are inadequacies and distortions with each method of measurement. However, when variance resulting from individual differences such as personal attributes and experience is taken into account, perceptual data, taken from school participants themselves, are usually accepted as a direct indicator of normative climate (Halpin and Croft 1963).

Several scales have been developed to measure different aspects of school climate and focus on different school levels. One of the most widely used school climate instruments--the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (O.C.D.Q.)--was initially developed by Halpin and Croft in 1963 to measure the impact of leadership style on the effectiveness and morale of corporate employees. Other important school climate instruments included the Pupil Control Ideology (P.C.I.) index, developed by

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy in 1967; the Learning Environment Inventory (LEI), developed by Anderson and Walberg in 1974; and the Quality of School Life (Q.S.L.) index, developed by Epstein and McPartland in 1976. These instruments were subsequently developed to measure the impact of such aspects of school climate as the condition of physical surroundings, teacher satisfaction, student satisfaction, degree of competitiveness, and so on.

Measuring School Climate in Sample Schools

For this report, OREA chose the Effective School Battery, a survey instrument developed by Gottfredson in 1984 in response to findings of Edmonds and others, to measure aspects of school climate relevant to middle schools. OREA adapted two sections of the instrument: the student form and the teacher form. The student form contains six subscales including safety; respect for students; planning and action; fairness of rules; student influence; and avoidance of grades as a sanction. The teacher form consists of the following subscales: school safety; morale, planning and action; smooth administration; resources; parent/community involvement; student influence; and avoidance of grades as a sanction. For a more complete description of how OREA used this instrument and its validity and reliability, refer to Appendix A.

In addition to using the Effective School Battery, OREA looked at other objective variables and subjective responses distinguishing each of the 18 schools.

STUDENT OUTCOMES IN SAMPLE SCHOOLS

Attendance Outcomes

Table 16 shows the range of attendance outcomes in the sample schools. Seven schools in the sample met the Chancellor's criterion for improved attendance for at least 50 percent of the program students. Six of these seven schools also increased their overall mean attendance rate.

The sample schools were selected in the spring of 1987 and ranked high, medium, and low on the basis of the percentage of A.I.D.P. students who increased their attendance that year. (See Chapter I for a full description of sample selection). A comparison of attendance of A.I.D.P. students in these schools for 1986-87 and 1987-88 showed that most of the schools in the sample retained their relative position in the ranking. However, there were a few exceptions. School 8 had formerly been fifteenth in the ranking, and schools 12 and 13 had been ranked 4 and 6, respectively. Seven of the schools (3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 14, and 16) increased the percentage of students whose attendance improved over the previous year. In ten schools, the percentage of students whose attendance improved was less in 1987-88 than it had been in 1986-87.

In this chapter, schools are identified numerically from number 1 to number 18, representing the highest to the lowest percentage of students whose attendance improved in 1987-88. The ranking remains the same throughout the chapter, regardless of what other outcomes are being compared.

TABLE 16

Attendance Outcomes for A.I.D.P. Students in Sample Schools

School Rank*	Percent of Students with Improved Attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88	1986-87 Baseline Attendance Rate	1987-88 End-of-Year Attendance Rate	Change in Attendance Rate from 1986-87 to 1987-88
1	74.0	77.0	81.4	4.4
2	64.8	77.7	79.5	1.8
3	63.0	79.2	79.8	0.6
4	59.8	73.3	77.6	4.3
5	58.8	80.8	82.5	1.7
6	55.7	80.3	79.9	- 0.4
7	50.8	79.4	79.9	0.5
8	49.3	73.3	69.1	- 4.2
9	48.6	76.3	73.6	- 2.7
10	47.7	80.8	79.8	- 1.0
11	47.5	82.2	81.6	- 0.6
12	46.2	81.9	78.2	- 3.7
13	45.6	82.4	80.9	- 1.5
14	40.0	80.6	76.0	- 4.6
15	39.5	78.0	74.3	- 3.7
16	39.3	74.1	68.2	- 5.9
17	35.0	75.8	70.6	- 5.2
18	35.0	79.7	75.6	- 4.1

* School rank was determined by the percentage of students who had improved attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88.

• Seven schools met the Chancellor's criterion of 50

Achievement Outcomes

Table 17 presents achievement outcomes in the sample schools in terms of the mean overall course pass rates and the percentage of students in each school who attained the Chancellor's objective for increasing their course pass rate. It shows that the attendance ranking of these schools was not consistent with achievement measures.

Fifteen of the 18 schools met the course pass rate objective although eight of the schools (5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 17) showed a decline in the mean course pass rate overall. Again, this meant that while students who had failed at least one course in the previous year improved their course pass rate in 1987-88, other students did less well in 1987-88 than they had in 1986-87. In six of those schools there was also an overall decline in the attendance rate of program students. Interestingly, in several schools (10, 14, 16, 18) that showed a significant decline in the overall attendance rate, there was an improvement in the mean course pass rate. In school 10, in which the attendance rate declined slightly, there was an overall increase in the average course pass rate of nearly 22 percent. Schools 10 and 16 had the largest percentage of students who met the course pass rate objective of all schools in the sample. This finding warrants further investigation on a per-student basis. If the same students who attend fewer days are, nonetheless, able to increase their course pass rates, this suggests that students may not be challenged enough by their course material to be motivated to

Table 17

Achievement Outcomes for
A.I.D.P. Students in Sample Schools

School Rank[a]	Percent of Students Who Met Course Pass Objective in 1987-88[b]	1986-1987 Baseline Mean Course pass Rate	1987-1988 End-of-year Mean Course Pass Rate	Change in Mean Course Pass Rate From 1986-87 to 1987-88
1	62.8	62.8	70.8	8.0
2	61.0	76.9	81.0	4.1
3	61.5	60.7	69.5	8.8
4	64.8	46.1	59.9	13.8
5	56.9	79.2	69.6	- 9.6
6	61.5	76.6	82.5	5.9
7	58.7	77.7	75.3	- 2.4
8	59.3	73.8	65.1	- 8.7
9	56.3	64.0	58.5	- 5.5
10	82.1	58.2	80.0	21.8
11	68.9	79.2	82.9	3.7
12	51.9	72.1	66.2	- 5.9
13	37.5	87.8	70.5	-17.3
14	77.6	74.5	81.2	6.7
15	49.3	68.6	63.4	- 5.2
16	82.5	61.0	84.5	23.5
17	44.6	67.6	65.9	- 1.7
18	53.8	60.8	60.9	0.1

[a] School rank was determined by the percentage of students in each school who had increased their attendance. Ranking is from high to low.

[b] The course pass rate objective, as defined by the Chancellor, refers to the percentage of students with at least one course failure in 1986-87, who increased their course pass rate in 1987-88.

attend school.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS

A profile of the 18 sample A.I.D.P. middle schools can be inferred from an examination of the demographic information provided by O.E.D.S. and from OREA interviews conducted with middle-school principals and facilitators. Table 18 presents this demographic data by school rank.

The total register of the schools ranged from 604 students to 1,810 students, with a mean of 1,015 students. The percentage of A.I.D.P. students in the schools ranged from a low of 9.3 percent to a high of 31.8 percent. As the absolute number of A.I.D.P. students in the schools was fairly constant, the proportion of A.I.D.P. students in a school is a reflection of the total register. Notably, smaller schools, or schools with a higher proportion of A.I.D.P. students tended to rank lower in terms of the percentage of program students who improved their attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88. This supports the finding in the literature noted earlier that smaller schools *per se* are not necessary more effective in terms of student outcomes, and suggests that other factors, such as the characteristics of the student populations of these schools and other contextual and climate variables, are more predictive of the success of school improvement efforts.

As in previous years, the percentage of low-income students, as reflected by the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-cost lunches, was higher in A.I.D.P. schools than the

TABLE 18

Demographic Characteristics of the 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools

School Rank	Total Register	Average Daily Attendance 1987-88	Percent General Education	Percent Special Education	Percent AIDP	Percent LEP	Ethnicity				Percent Free/ Reduced Lunch	Percent Teachers in School 3+ Years	Captive Lunch	Percent AIDP Students No Phone	Average Class Size	CSIP
							White	Black	Hispanic	Asian						
1	1095	80.4	88.4	11.6	16.7	9.0	49.1	23.2	18.3	9.3	56.5	92	Yes	8	30.3	Yes
2	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	100	Yes	10	•	•
3	1504	87.1	96.8	3.2	11.7	12.5	15.0	50.5	23.8	10.2	75.1	82	Yes	8	26.5	No
4	976	84.3	85.5	14.1	17.5	14.9	.1	53.6	46.3	0.0	59.4	88	No	50	25.3	No
5	1054	87.9	96.2	5.8	17.9	8.2	20.9	27.9	42.6	8.1	80.7	88	Yes	8	26.8	No
6	1810	83.9	98.7	1.3	9.3	13.3	6.3	27.3	59.7	6.7	79.1	•	Yes	20	30.1	No
7	797	83.6	94.9	5.1	24.5	2.6	0.0	87.8	12.2	0.0	77.8	77	Yes	10	29.1	Yes
8	876	78.5	83.2	16.8	20.1	9.8	5.7	36.5	57.2	.6	51.3	90	No	10	31.5	No
9	977	83.3	93.1	6.9	16.5	2.5	.3	48.8	50.4	.5	80.4	78	No	40	30.4	No
10	1176	85.5	87.2	12.8	16.1	3.4	2.6	43.8	51.7	2.0	86.7	75	Yes	10	30.1	No
11	1009	88.1	87.1	12.9	19.6	1.3	54.9	2.3	1.2	0.0	60.6	81	Yes	•	32.6	No
12	909	81.8	89.1	10.9	19.7	9.7	.4	18.7	78.4	2.4	71.9	84	No	50	23.4	Yes
13	797	89.2	89.6	10.4	18.6	2.3	55.2	24.8	13.2	6.4	53.2	82	Yes	15	31.0	Yes
14	646	79.0	81.0	19.0	28.6	24.6	.3	18.0	81.6	.2	100.0	87	Yes	75	30.8	No
15	838	63.0	75.1	24.9	22.8	14.0	.2	31.7	68.0	0.0	63.8	65	No	50	25.0	No
16	1123	85.4	96.6	3.4	13.8	15.2	4.8	4.5	86.8	3.9	81.7	76	No	33	29.3	Yes
17	1058	74.2	91.0	9.0	16.1	12.1	.5	31.6	67.9	.1	60.6	76	No	50	29.2	No
18	604	78.7	84.1	15.9	31.8	9.6	.5	47.2	50.8	1.3	80.4	77	No	25	31.6	Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

citywide average of 54.3 percent. In 16 of the 18 schools, the percentage exceeded the citywide average. The percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch did not appear to be related to the percentage whose attendance improved as reflected by school rank. The ethnic breakdown of the sample schools was representative of the ethnic groups generally found in low socioeconomic districts: eight of the 18 sample schools were predominantly Hispanic, two were predominantly Black, five were roughly divided between Hispanic and Black students, and three were predominantly White. Although many of the lower-ranked schools were predominantly Hispanic, schools 2, 5 and 6 in the top third of the ranking contradict this pattern. What appears to be more consistently correlated than ethnicity or language with the ranking of schools, is the proportion of A.I.D.P. students estimated by facilitators to be without home telephones. (See schools 12, 14, 15, 16 and 17). School 5, which was the most highly integrated school in terms of ethnicity, having large proportions of Black, Hispanic, White, and Asian students, was in the top third of the ranking. Per-student data on ethnicity and home language of the students within the A.I.D.P. programs were not collected for this analysis. It was assumed that in terms of these characteristics, the A.I.D.P. student populations were representative of the schools from which they were selected. Whether that is in fact true may be an issue to examine in the future.

PROGRAM VARIATION AMONG SCHOOLS

While Chapter II described the citywide A.I.D.P. program as a whole, there was considerable variation in the individual school programs in terms of the ways in which the Chancellor's guidelines were implemented, the student participants selected, and the type, range, and frequency of program services delivered. These differences are described here.

The Full-time Facilitator Position

Of the 18 sample schools, 13 chose to allocate the full-time position to one staff member. Five schools allocated less time to the facilitator, in some cases splitting the facilitator's time between an A.I.D.P. and non-A.I.D.P. position, between two A.I.D.P. positions, or between two schools. It is unclear how the schools that used a part-time facilitator used the balance of their facilitation allocation, if at all.

Facilitators, although they still complained of excessive paperwork, seemed to feel that the full-time status allotted for their position was appropriate. Two facilitators specifically mentioned that the increase in time enabled them, personally, to reach more students; and virtually all agreed that the additional time permitted better organization of the increased A.I.D.P. staff and resources. A facilitator's full or part-time status, however, was not found to be relevant to a schools' attainment of the Chancellors objective for increasing attendance.

The Alternative Education Component

It is clear from the aggregate data presented in Chapter II

that this component was only partially implemented. Fewer than half of the A.I.D.P. students across the city received the service.

M.S.S.R. data reflected a high degree of variation in the percentage of students in the 18 sample schools who received any alternative education, as well as in the type of instruction offered in each school. (See Table 19.) Two-thirds of the schools in the sample provided remedial reading. However, the percentage of students receiving that service ranged from 4.0 in one school to 75.0 in another. Thirteen of the schools provided mathematics remediation. Percentages of students receiving that service ranged from 1.4 to 73.8. Only three schools provided remediation in writing, with percentages of students receiving that service ranging from 0.5 to 55.3. Thirteen schools provided enrichment classes of some kind. One school provided no alternative education services at all. The facilitator in that school felt that students in his school were absent for reasons other than poor academic achievement and consequently required no supplementary education.

Facilitators' reactions to the addition of remedial/ enrichment classes depended on how well the career education component had been implemented in the past. Naturally, facilitators who had implemented successful career education classes previously, and who had to replace them with remedial education classes, voiced disappointment and recommended the reinstatement of the career education component; while those who

Table 19

Percent of Students Receiving Alternative Education Service in 18 Sample Middle Schools by School Rank

		REMEDIAL			ENRICHMENT	
	Any Alternative Education	Remedial Math	Remedial Reading	Remedial Writing	Career Education	Other Enrichment
School 1	58.5	31.7	28.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
School 2	54.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School 3	46.6	42.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School 4	28.7	0.0	28.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
School 5	33.5	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
School 6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School 7	75.4	73.8	74.9	0.0	57.4	0.0
School 8	48.3	14.2	34.1	0.0	12.5	0.0
School 9	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
School 10	61.9	25.4	16.4	0.0	0.5	46.6
School 11	53.0	24.7	7.1	0.5	1.5	35.4
School 12	55.3	0.0	0.6	55.3	0.0	0.6
School 13	39.2	1.4	16.9	0.0	0.0	21.6
School 14	61.6	28.6	9.2	0.0	1.1	24.9
School 15	65.4	28.8	0.0	0.0	36.6	0.5
School 16	72.9	32.3	21.9	18.1	0.0	18.7
School 17	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
School 18	77.1	29.7	20.8	0.0	44.3	0.0

felt the career education component had been less successful were not sorry to see it go. Four schools in the sample (7, 8, 15, and 18) continued to provide career education to a substantial number of students as a type of enrichment. In general, the 1987-88 requirement that the remedial/enrichment classes be scheduled rather than pull-out made them easier to implement than the pull-out career education programs that had been in operation in previous years.

Staffing for the alternative education component, when it was provided, varied among schools. P.C.E.N. funds provided a program with one full-time teaching position to be apportioned as the individual program saw fit. Some schools in the sample divided remedial mathematics, remedial reading, and enrichment classes among three different teachers; while others used one teacher for all alternative education classes.

Range and Frequency of A.I.D.P. Services in Individual Schools

Tables 20 through 22 present the range and frequency of services provided to A.I.D.P. students in the sample schools. Within the attendance outreach component, the majority of the sample schools provided over 90 percent of their students with contacts to the home including mailings, home visits, and/or telephone calls. (See Table 20.) However, in one school, (School 1) only one-third of the students received mailings; and in another school (School 13) only 41 percent of the students received home visits. The number of telephone calls made to students by the school programs ranged from a mean of less than

Table 20

Percent of Students Receiving Attendance Services
in 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools
by School Rank and Mean Number of Service Contacts

	% Rec Any Outreach	% Rec Mail Sent	Mean Mail	% Rec Phone Calls	Mean Phone Calls	% Rec Home Visits	Mean Home Visits	% Rec Sch/Par Attend Conf	Mean # of Conf.	% Rec Sch. Stud. Guid. Conference	Mean # of Guid. Conferences
School 1	100.0	33.9	0.9	100.0	36.6	91.3	4.3	65.6	1.4	88.5	4.0
School 2	100.0	95.4	4.4	98.9	14.4	96.6	3.1	29.3	0.4	48.3	0.9
School 3	100.0	96.0	8.3	96.0	13.4	81.8	3.1	24.4	0.4	68.2	2.1
School 4	95.9	61.4	3.2	80.7	6.1	87.1	7.4	05.3	0.1	04.6	.1
School 5	99.5	66.0	4.8	94.1	14.6	89.4	3.9	04.9	0.1	01.6	.1
School 6	100.0	100.0	9.7	84.6	3.9	92.9	3.8	41.4	0.6	61.5	1.9
School 7	97.9	87.2	3.3	93.3	16.2	84.6	5.5	34.9	0.5	31.8	.4
School 8	99.4	98.9	7.3	86.9	4.2	94.3	2.9	39.8	0.3	65.9	.2
School 9	100.0	98.8	7.5	93.5	6.0	96.9	3.8	13.0	0.2	64.0	3.5
School 10	100.0	98.1	6.5	92.1	4.8	85.7	2.6	37.0	0.7	89.4	4.6
School 11	99.0	62.1	1.7	99.0	13.6	97.0	3.3	28.8	0.6	30.8	.6
School 12	99.4	96.6	6.7	95.5	6.7	92.7	5.6	27.9	0.5	53.1	1.0
School 13	99.3	71.6	1.7	98.0	12.3	40.5	0.8	04.7	0.1	64.8	1.7
School 14	99.9	93.5	10.2	66.5	1.8	74.1	3.0	78.9	2.0	80.0	2.9
School 15	100.0	96.3	5.5	68.1	4.2	95.3	2.9	11.5	0.3	11.5	.2
School 16	100.0	71.6	6.3	72.9	8.1	98.7	5.9	25.8	0.4	13.5	.9
School 17	100.0	99.4	15.1	91.2	5.7	97.1	3.0	48.2	1.2	91.2	13.8
School 18	99.0	82.8	7.0	87.0	7.4	88.0	4.5	27.1	0.4	17.7	.3

two to more than 36 per year. The number of home visits students received ranged from one to seven or more for the year.

In all but two schools in the sample, fewer than 50 percent of the students' parents attended parent-school attendance conferences. (See Table 20.) In two schools, fewer than five percent of the students' parents attended. Within the sample, the percentage of the students in each school receiving school-student attendance conferences ranged from 1.6 percent in one school to 91.2 percent in another, with ten schools providing it to fewer than ten percent of the students.

Students' parents also received comparatively few guidance sessions. In only four schools in the sample did over 50 percent of the students' parents receive guidance sessions. On average, 31 percent of the students' parents in each school received the service, with two schools providing it to fewer than ten percent of the students' parents. (See Table 21.)

Table 22 shows that some high ranking schools provided a large proportion of students with attendance incentives although this was not always the case. For the percentages of students in each school receiving this service as well as high school linkages and extended school day activities refer to the table.

Differences in Proportions of Subgroups of Program Students

Table 23 presents the proportions of student sub-groups in the A.I.D.P. sample schools.

Special Education Students. The addition of these students to the A.I.D.P. program affected the implementation of the

Table 21

Percent of Students Receiving Guidance Services in 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle Schools by School Rank

	Any Guidance	% Indiv. Sessions	Mean Indiv. Sessions	% Group Sessions	Mean Group Sessions	% Parent Sessions	Mean Parent Sessions
School 1	50.0	51.4	1.9	22.4	0.4	29.5	0.7
School 2	86.8	63.2	3.0	78.2	2.6	13.8	0.2
School 3	93.7	67.0	3.3	79.5	1.9	21.6	0.4
School 4	73.1	19.9	0.5	62.6	0.7	11.1	0.2
School 5	95.1	94.6	4.6	87.0	4.2	53.5	1.2
School 6	94.7	85.8	3.0	51.5	1.1	57.4	1.4
School 7	93.8	86.2	4.7	80.0	3.0	35.4	0.6
School 8	96.0	80.7	3.8	67.6	3.8	40.3	0.8
School 9	79.5	62.7	2.5	57.1	1.3	32.3	0.7
School 10	87.8	77.8	2.9	77.8	3.5	32.3	0.9
School 11	86.4	77.3	3.5	82.8	6.3	31.8	0.7
School 12	96.1	91.1	5.9	84.9	8.2	53.1	1.1
School 13	96.6	82.4	2.8	85.8	2.7	64.2	1.8
School 14	87.0	74.6	3.3	78.9	6.3	23.8	0.4
School 15	81.7	78.0	2.5	61.8	1.1	3.7	0.0
School 16	40.6	38.7	0.8	10.3	0.2	7.1	0.1
School 17	70.0	58.8	1.7	19.4	0.3	41.2	0.8
School 18	65.5	29.2	0.4	13.0	0.1	3.1	0.0

- Most schools provided a majority of the students with individual sessions (15) and group guidance sessions (14). In only 4 schools did a majority of the students' parents participate in parent guidance sessions.

TABLE 22

Percent of Students Receiving Other A.I.D.P. Services in 18 Sample A.I.D.P. Middle School by School Rank

	% Receive Attendance Incentives	% Receive Extended School Day	% Rec High School Links
School 1	92.3	0.0	58.5
School 2	87.9	57.5	73.6
School 3	78.4	17.6	61.9
School 4	70.8	37.4	20.5
School 5	78.9	9.7	14.1
School 6	61.5	65.1	69.8
School 7	90.3	52.3	47.2
School 8	26.7	48.3	23.3
School 9	82.0	18.0	31.1
School 10	36.5	64.0	36.0
School 11	68.7	63.6	65.2
School 12	35.8	32.4	38.5
School 13	1.4	31.8	31.1
School 14	24.3	58.9	29.7
School 15	48.2	18.3	51.8
School 16	73.5	58.7	21.3
School 17	70.0	30.6	61.8
School 18	84.4	90.6	59.9

TABLE 23

Characteristics of the A.I.D.P. Populations in the 18 Sample middle Schools in 1987-88, by School Rank

School Rank	Total A.I.D.P. Population	Percent Special Education in A.I.D.P.	Percent Students in Temporary Housing in A.I.D.P.	Percent LEP in A.I.D.P.
1	183	16.9	0.5	3.3
2	174	10.9	0.6	3.4
3	176	4.0	1.1	6.8
4	171	1.8	1.8	5.8
5	185	5.4	0.5	2.2
6	169	2.4	0.0	5.3
7	195	12.8	1.0	2.6
8	176	14.8	14.8	6.3
9	161	9.9	1.2	5.6
10	189	16.4	1.1	1.6
11	198	7.6	0.0	1.5
12	179	12.9	1.1	9.5
13	148	7.4	0.0	0.7
14	185	11.9	1.1	18.4
15	191	14.1	0.5	16.8
16	155	22.6	0.6	7.1
17	170	5.9	1.8	15.3
18	192	6.8	2.6	7.3

program in some schools to a great degree. Within the sample, the average percentage of special education students per program was 10.3. However, in one school, less than one percent of its program population consisted of special education students; while in another school, 23 percent of its program population consisted of special education students. Proportions of special education students were distributed fairly evenly throughout the ranking of schools by attendance objective. However, it is interesting that the two schools with large percentages of special education students (schools 10 and 16,) had the highest percentage of students who met the course pass rate objective and the greatest increase in overall mean pass rate. At this level of analysis it is not known whether the special education students themselves made the improvement. In general, the educational needs of these students were specifically addressed in their respective special education settings, where they received individualized attention. Perhaps another explanation for such academic gains in these schools is that their A.I.D.P. programs provided a combination of at least two areas of remediation plus enrichment. (See Table 19.)

Virtually all 18 facilitators in the sample reported that A.I.D.P. students in special education received the same facilitation, attendance outreach, guidance, health, and linkage services.

Despite the relatively few special education students served overall and the apparently smooth integration of special

education students into the regular A.I.D.P. programs, some facilitators were critical of their inclusion. These facilitators felt that special education students with attendance problems had needs that were different from the general education A.I.D.P. population. In some cases, the addition of special education students represented an increase in a school's A.I.D.P. population over and above 150 students, which, despite additional funds provided for these students, taxed the A.I.D.P. staff. In spite of these comments, the presence of special education students in school programs did not negatively affect outcomes.

Other Special Students. Another group of A.I.D.P. students having special needs were students in temporary housing. Although there were only a total of 202 of these students in the entire program, they tended to be concentrated in a few schools. All but three of the schools in the sample had fewer than ten students in temporary housing in their A.I.D.P. programs; in another school, however, there were 26 of these students, which represented 15 percent of its program population. Although the proportions of students in temporary housing was not found to be significantly statistically predictive of program outcomes, it was found to be related to facilitators' ratings of their communinication with students. The higher the proportion of students in temporary housing in a school, the lower the facilitators' rating of their communication with students. Citywide attendance outcomes for this group were the lowest of all subgroups of students. (See Chapter II.)

The distribution of LEP students also was not equal among school programs. The percentage of LEP students in school A.I.D.P. prorgams ranged from less than one to more than 18. Programs having higher proportions of LEP students (12, 14, 15, 17) were in the least successful third of the ranking of schools by the attendance objective. Once again, however, these same schools had higher proportions of students with no home telephones, suggesting that there may be a communication and language barrier between school staff and the families of these students.

IV. OUTCOME PREDICTORS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM SUCCESS

ANALYSIS METHODS

OREA analysts examined over 100 variables, including aspects of program implementation, school context and climate, and student characteristics, to determine which variables were most closely related to successful A.I.D.P. program outcomes. The analyses were based on aggregated school data for the 18 sample schools. In a few cases where there were missing data, the analyses were conducted on fewer than 18 schools. Although statistical correlations often suggest a relationship, it is important to keep in mind that such cause and effect cannot be assumed. The following findings, therefore, are advisory, not prescriptive.

The results of statistical regression analyses and multiple correlation analyses point to a number of statistical "predictor" variables that showed strong relationships with some or all of the following outcome variables: overall mean attendance rate, the percent of students who increased their overall mean pass rate, and reading and mathematics scores. These statistical predictor variables are presented below.

VARIABLES RELATED TO ATTENDANCE OUTCOMES

The single most powerful statistical predictor in the analyses of the 1987-88 mean attendance rate for A.I.D.P. students was whether or not students were permitted to leave the school for lunch. Mean attendance for A.I.D.P. students was

found to be higher in schools where the student body as a whole was required to eat lunch in school. This variable alone accounted for 62 percent of the variance in the analysis of the attendance rate data for the A.I.D.P. students in the 18 schools. Mandatory in-school lunch was also a statistical predictor of the percent of program students whose attendance improved.

There are several possible interpretations of this finding. First, it may be that mandatory in-school lunch reduces the number of half-day (afternoon) absences, thereby increasing the overall attendance rate for the A.I.D.P. students. Secondly, mandatory in-school lunch may be an indication of firm leadership and a schoolwide effort to retain students despite the burden of providing staff to supervise lunchrooms. Schools in the sample with mandatory in-school lunch programs had higher average daily schoolwide attendance than schools that did not. These schools had a mean average daily attendance of 84.9 percent in 1987-88, while schools that did not have a mandatory in-school lunch program had a mean average daily attendance of 78.7 percent. Mandatory in-school lunch, and other factors associated with it require further exploration. It may be characteristic of schools that place clear limits on students, since other correlations show that schools in which students who were surveyed felt they had a greater influence on school rules and school policy had poorer mean attendance.

The number of attendance outreach calls made to students' homes was also significantly related to attendance rate

(r = .46). More important, it was the single most powerful predictor in the analyses of the percent of students who improved their attendance from 1986-87 to 1987-88 (r =.61). Schools in which a higher percentage of phone calls was made to students' homes had higher proportions of A.I.D.P. students who improved their attendance during the school year (r =.50). As might be expected, the mean number of calls per A.I.D.P. student was also highly correlated with the percentage of A.I.D.P. students who improved their attendance (r =.66). Not surprisingly, those schools in which the reported percentage of A.I.D.P. students without home telephones was higher had a smaller percentage of students who improved their attendance than those in which a greater percentage of students had telephones (r =.55).

Two other variables that bear a strong relationship to attendance rate were the use of adult volunteers (r =.55), and the percent of students who received group guidance (r =.54). The latter correlation suggests that programs that encourage more peer support among students may be more effective in increasing attendance.

Variables Related to Achievement Outcomes

Aspects of parent involvement and administrative leadership were found to be highly statistically predictive of academic achievement, as measured by course pass rates, D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores.

The single most powerful statistical predictor in the analyses of 1987-88 mean pass rate data for the A.I.D.P. students

was the home-visit contact rate (r =.70). The home-visit contact rate was determined by dividing the number of times a home visit resulted in face-to-face contact with a parent by the number of home-visit attempts made during the month. OREA evaluators reviewed March 1988 home-visit logs during school site visits. The month of March 1988 was chosen for this analysis because it appeared to be the most complete school month in the spring 1988 semester. Students in schools with higher home-visit contact rates had higher mean pass rates than students in schools with lower home-visit contact rates. In addition, schools with higher home-visit contact rates had fewer referrals to family court than schools that had lower home-visit contact rates.

Other forms of personal contact with students' parents were also found to be related to their achievement. The percentage of A.I.D.P. students who received phone calls at home was the single most powerful statistical predictor of the sample schools' average 1988 D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores for the A.I.D.P. students (r =.63, r =.55, respectively). The higher the percentage of A.I.D.P. students in a school who received calls, the higher the average D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores of A.I.D.P. students. Also significantly positively related to test scores were the percentages of students whose parents received guidance services, (r =.48 and r =.63, respectively), and the use of parent volunteers in the school (r =.57, and r =.61, respectively). In view of these findings, it is not surprising that facilitator's ratings of their communication with parents

were also highly correlated to the mean pass rates (r =.58), D.R.P. scores (r =.57), and MAT mathematics scores (r =.53) of the A.I.D.P. students.

The number of Pupil Personnel Committee (P.P.C.) meetings attended by the principal was the second most powerful statistical predictor of the 1987-88 pass rate in the sample schools (r =.59). Overall pass rates of program students were higher in those schools in which the principal attended more P.P.C. meetings. The number of P.P.C. meetings the principal attended and the level of involvement of the principal in the P.P.C. were also highly correlated to the percentage of A.I.D.P. students who increased their pass rates after having failed one or more courses in the previous year (r =.57). Together, home-visit contact rate and the number of P.P.C. meetings attended by the principal accounted for almost 70 percent of the variance in 1987-88 mean pass rate analyses.

Mandatory in-school lunch, which, as previously stated, was highly correlated with positive attendance outcomes, was also correlated with improvements in overall course pass rate (r =.63, and D.R.P. (r =.47) and MAT mathematics test scores (r =.46). These findings suggest that the academic achievement of A.I.D.P. students, like their attendance, is sensitive to administrative support of the A.I.D.P. program and to schoolwide attendance efforts in general.

To credit the other A.I.D.P. program services, there was a significant correlation between the percent of students who

received extended school-day services and the percent of students who improved their pass rates after having failed at least one course the previous year (r =.52). In support of this finding, it appears that the eleven schools in the sample that implemented an extended school-day program provided some type of tutoring to students during that time.

Another program service that bore a strong relationship to academic achievement as reflected by mean MAT mathematics scores was group guidance (r =.63). School programs in which higher percent-ages of students participated in group guidance sessions had higher average scores on this test than those that did not. Once again, this suggests that schools providing activities that encourage peer interaction, support, and cooperation among students may attain positive results, both academically and in terms of attendance.

The percent of teaching staff that remained at a school three or more years was found to be significantly associated with average D.R.P. scores (r =.50). The higher the percentage of teachers who had worked in the school three or more years, the higher the average D.R.P. scores of A.I.D.P. students.

If teacher retention at a school and strong leadership are potential predictors of positive student outcomes, the following correlations are also of interest.

Staff evaluations of principal leadership were highly correlated with the percent of teachers who stayed in the school for three years or more years. The facilitator's evaluation of

the principal's leadership was highly correlated with ratings of staff morale (r =.67) and general school environment (r =.55). It was also related to the principals' rating of the teachers' knowledge of their subject matter (r =.79) and teachers' willingness to put in extra time to serve students (r =.52). Teachers' perceptions of their role in school planning were significantly correlated with staff morale (r =.69). In addition, facilitators' rating of principal support correlated with facilitators' ratings of communication with non-A.I.D.P. staff (r =.55). This finding suggests that support and involvement by the school principal has positive connotations for the integration and acceptance of the A.I.D.P. program by other school staff who serve A.I.D.P. students.

NEGATIVE FACTORS

Some building characteristics were also statistically predictive of achievement outcomes. Problems with door operation and poor condition of school walls and other surfaces were negatively associated with D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores.

Other factors pertaining to both students and school context were negatively related to D.R.P. and MAT mathematics scores. These included the number of student pregnancies, the number of drug-related incidents, and the reported number of student-staff conflicts. Not surprisingly, the number of drug-related incidents was negatively related to staff morale. This supports the findings in the literature concerning the positive effects of an orderly, safe atmosphere on morale and student outcomes.

Students at Higher Risk: Schools with Large LEP Populations

The results of these analyses indicate that there is a group of students who are at higher risk than the average A.I.D.P. student and who should receive more attention. Citywide statistics for the 777 LEP students in the middle school A.I.D.P. program show that LEP A.I.D.P. students had attendance and course pass rates that were at least on a par with the overall A.I.D.P. student population. (See Tables 12 and 13). However, the A.I.D.P. schools in the sample that had high percentages of LEP students in the program and large numbers of Hispanic and LEP students in the school tended to have program outcomes consisting of lower mean attendance rates, lower percentages of students who improved their attendance, and lower overall D.R.P. scores. This somewhat contradictory finding suggests the possibility that the Hispanic students who are not LEP-entitled require, but may not be receiving, educational and language-related services in addition to specialized attendance outreach efforts; while those who are LEP-entitled and are receiving appropriate services perform at least as well as the A.I.D.P. population at large. It is also true that these same schools had high percentages of program students who had no telephones at home and therefore had less access to the most frequently employed family outreach services that appear to have a positive effect on attendance and academic achievement. (See Appendix B for a summary of significant correlations.)

IMPLICATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL A.I.D.P. PROGRAMS

These findings have implications for operating successful A.I.D.P. programs. The very high percentages of statistical variance explained for each outcome, coupled with the small sample size in this evaluation, indicate that the predictive variables discussed are both significant and educationally meaningful.

In terms of services provided by the A.I.D.P. program, frequent attendance follow-up to students' homes was the most significant in terms of its relationship to student outcomes. For example, where home contact was made through both home visits and phone calls, achievement and attendance were observed to improve. However, these services are only effective under the right circumstances. Calls to students' homes are effective attendance improvement measures only when there are phones at home. Though contacting parents by mail was used to a greater extent in schools in which fewer students have telephones, mail contacts do not appear to be nearly as effective in promoting attendance as personal contacts. In these schools other effective outreach measures should be increased. Four home visits a year, the average that the A.I.D.P. students received, may not be sufficient to engage the families of these particular students. However, as with telephone contact rate, the percentage of home visits resulting in successful contact may be a result of factors other than the frequency of the implementation of the service. For one thing, visits made to

students' homes during the school day may not be successful in cases where there are high percentages of working single parents. It is also possible, given the high correlation between schools having both a large percentage of students with no phones and a large percentage of Hispanic and LEP-entitled students in the school, that there are language and cultural barriers inhibiting effective communication between school and family. Consequently, matching appropriate school staff to students whenever possible, increasing staffing and staff hours, and providing staff training may be necessary to achieve more effective school/parent communication in these schools. Making greater use of community-based organizations to help bridge the gap between schools and less accessible families, or families in crisis, may also be necessary.

Another program service that was related to both attendance and achievement outcomes was group guidance. This relationship suggests that programs that provide activities involving peer support may be more successful. Programs providing extended school-day services (of which most provided some type of tutoring) showed increases in course pass rates of students who had failed at least one course in the previous year.

It is interesting that these analyses revealed no statistically significant relationship between outcomes and the implementation of attendance incentives, an A.I.D.P. component consistently reported to be popular with students. It is possible that in some schools this component can create some

inconsistencies with the school-reward system overall and have a negative impact on school climate, thereby cancelling out its positive effects. An often-reported concern with the incentive program is that it can create stresses in the school such as resentment among non-A.I.D.P. students because they do not receive attention and rewards for coming to school, while poor attenders are "rewarded."

Mandatory in-school lunch, on the other hand, a procedure which is not liked by some students, was found to have high statistically predictive correlations with both attendance and achievement measures. It is possible that the in-school lunch program (and the in-school breakfast program, which are both available to all students) can be implemented in more schools and be made more attractive to students: this would make school itself more attractive and increase attendance and academic achievement.

Strong leadership with a commitment to schoolwide attendance and achievement, and direct principal involvement in the A.I.D.P. program, were found to be strong indicators of school climate and strong statistical predictors of program success. Where principals implemented a mandatory in-school lunch policy and attended P.P.C. meetings, achievement and attendance was higher. Where principals supported staff and included them in planning, it followed that staff morale, teacher retention, and student outcomes were higher.

Parent involvement was another significant predictor in

this evaluation. Greater parent involvement in guidance activities and the use of adult volunteers in the school were highly associated with both higher D.R.P. and higher MAT mathematics scores for A.I.D.P. students. Facilitators' ratings of communication with families correlated highly with staff ratings of staff morale, indicating that parent involvement and support have a positive impact on school climate.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The 1987-88 A.I.D.P. program achieved two of the three performance criteria established by the Chancellor. Two-thirds of the A.I.D.P. students who failed at least one subject in 1986-87 increased their pass rate in 1987-88. In addition, well over 50 percent of the A.I.D.P. students (a projected 90.7 percent) passed to the next highest grade in spring 1988.

The A.I.D.P. program approached, but failed to achieve, the attendance criterion cited in the Chancellor's guidelines, with 47.7 percent of the A.I.D.P. students increasing their attendance rates from 1986-87 to 1987-88. This was a lower percentage than had improved their attendance the previous year. The mean attendance rate for the A.I.D.P. students dropped 2.1 points from 79.0 in 1986-87 to 76.9 in 1987-88. However, when the median attendance rate of the A.I.D.P. students selected on the basis of the first two attendance criteria was compared to that of a citywide sample group of students who met the same attendance criteria but were not served by the A.I.D.P. program, the group of A.I.D.P. students demonstrated some improvement from 1986-87 to 1987-88, while the comparison group did not.

As in previous years, the A.I.D.P. program proved more successful with some categories of students than with others. For example, 50.4 percent of the sixth grade A.I.D.P. students had higher attendance in 1987-88 than in 1986-87, supporting the finding in the literature and the commentary of the A.I.D.P.

staff that the program is more successful in the earlier grades.

The data also suggest that while the A.I.D.P. program is successful with some students, others are either at greater risk, or more inaccessible to present program efforts. These groups include students in temporary housing, the portion of the Hispanic population that may not be quite eligible for bilingual services but at the same time not fluent enough in English to succeed in a mainstream setting, and students without home telephones. A fourth at-risk group appears to be male students. Of the 9.3 percent of the A.I.D.P. students who were projected to be held over, a disproportionate percentage were male. Each of these groups of students has particular needs that must be explored and addressed. It is incumbent upon the A.I.D.P. program to develop effective attendance improvement strategies for these students.

The A.I.D.P. program is successful in some schools, depending on how the program was implemented and upon particular aspects of the school context. Schools in which the principals demonstrated commitment to and support of the program by their involvement in the P.P.C. and by their support of A.I.D.P. and other school staff, tended to be more successful. Similarly, schools in which principals fostered a climate in which there were clear limits placed on students, including mandatory in-school lunch, improved the attendance and achievement of students. Schools in which principals demonstrated support of teaching staff and placed a schoolwide emphasis on attendance had

more successful A.I.D.P. programs.

Program services found to be related to positive outcomes include frequent, well planned attendance follow-up and outreach to the homes of students; guidance activities, especially with groups of students and parents of students, and some form of alternative education. Program weaknesses included incomplete implementation of the alternative education component (fewer than 50 percent of the A.I.D.P. students citywide participated in alternative education activities), not enough opportunities for parent involvement, and inadequate guidance staffing.

There is also some evidence that aspects of the A.I.D.P. program have negative impact on school climate in general. Attendance incentives in the form of prizes, trips, and high-interest activities for A.I.D.P. students have been reported by some principals to foster resentment and jealousy among non-A.I.D.P. students, although there is evidence that this program feature had a positive impact. In some schools, split staff positions such as A.I.D.P. guidance counselors who share their time between two schools, or between the A.I.D.P. population and the total student population, can also create conflicts of interest. Students returning to school after long absences increase class size and require special attention from school staff, who, in turn, need more administrative support. However, despite these added stresses, all the principals in the sample stated that they felt that A.I.D.P. program had a positive impact on their students and would like to see it continue to be

implemented in their schools.

In summary, the success of the A.I.D.P. program is, in large part, contingent upon a positive school climate and the appropriate matching of services to students. Program design and implementation must be flexible enough to accommodate differences among schools. Principals' support of and commitment to efforts to improve attendance and achievement of at-risk students is critical for students to achieve success.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the success of the A.I.D.P. program is largely dependent upon school characteristics and aspects of school climate, program guidelines should be made flexible to accommodate differences among schools. Efforts to promote schoolwide acceptance and support of the program should be encouraged by the principal. Similarly, program components such as attendance incentives and high-interest activities to encourage attendance should not be at odds with overall school objectives. To facilitate the attainment of attendance objectives, principals should be involved in program planning and decision making whenever possible. This includes an ongoing dialogue with the facilitator of the A.I.D.P. program, participating in the P.P.C. committee, and encouraging communication between A.I.D.P. and regular school staff.

Principals should consider implementation of school procedures found to enhance program success, such as mandatory in-school lunch. The school lunch program, an activity that is available to all students, can be made more attractive by including recreational activities or music.

Despite evidence of the benefits of parent involvement, particularly in the areas of parent guidance sessions and school-parent attendance conferences, the parents of comparatively few A.I.D.P. students received these program services. Efforts should be made to increase these activities, even if it is

necessary to increase guidance staff or staff hours. Parents who speak a language other than English should be served by appropriate staff. Efforts should be made to assist parents in crises, including referring them to community-based agencies for support services. Parent-involvement activities should address individual preferences and needs of parents whenever possible as well as encourage them to be involved with school policy. Parents with small children can be accommodated by using A.I.D.P. students as babysitters during meetings and conferences.

Group guidance and other cooperative activities among students should also be increased.

Students in the earlier grades should receive attendance intervention as these students appear to be the most receptive to program intervention.

Home visits to students who have no telephones at home should be increased. Specific family outreach strategies should be developed for families with working parents, or families in crisis so that school-parent contact can be more successful. Increased support to family assistants in the form of staff training, additional staff for home visit teams, and flexible staff hours should be provided.

The alternative education component should be instituted in schools that are not providing it. This includes clarification of the guidelines by the central office as well as onsite implementation. Students' attainment of basic skills should continue to be given as much emphasis as attendance. Schools

having successful extended-day enrichment programs should continue providing this service to students.

A greater effort must be made to ascertain and provide for the needs of students who appear to be at greater risk than the general A.I.D.P. population. These include Hispanic students who are not LEP entitled, male students, students in temporary housing, and students with no home telephones. Effective attendance outreach strategies and other school supports should be developed to address the specific needs of these students.

An issue of concern is the fact that many schools, while improving course pass rates, decreased average attendance of A.I.D.P. students. It is possible that classroom attendance in subject classes is not receiving enough emphasis as a criteria for passing courses. It is also possible that the course material itself is not challenging enough to be an incentive for students to attend school. It is the responsibility of schools to maintain high expectations for students and challenge students academically while providing the supports necessary for them to succeed.

REFERENCES

Anderson, C.S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 52, No.3, 368-420.

Anderson, G.J., and Walberg, H.J. (1974). Learning environments. In H.J. Walberg, (Ed.), Evaluation of educational performances. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen.

Bell, W.E. (1979). Obstacles to urban school renewal. Theory into Practice, 18, 65-72.

Brookover, W.B., and Lezotte, L.W. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement (Executive Summary). Occasional Paper No.17, Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Deal, T.E., and Celotti, L.D. (1980). Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan. Bloomington, IN.

Duke, D.L., and Perry, C. (1978). Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B.F. Skinner have failed? Adolescence, 13, 375-392.

Edmonds, R.R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 1, 15-18, and 20-24.

Ellet, C.D., and Walberg, H.J. (1979). Principals' competency, environment, and outcomes. In H.J. Walberg, (Ed.), Educational environments and effects. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Epstein, J.L. and McPartland, J.M. (1976). The conceptual measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.

Feldvebel, A.M. (1964). Organizational Climate, social class and educational output. Administrator's Notebook, 12, 8.

Gottfredson, G.D. (1985). Effective school battery. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Halpin, A.W. and Croft, D.B. (1963). The organizational climate of schools. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Maxwell, R.E. (1968). Leader behavior of principals: A study of ten inner-city elementary schools of Flint, Michigan. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts, 28A, 2950A.

Miller, H.E. (1969). An investigational climate as a variable in pupil achievement among 29 elementary schools in an urban school district. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 29, 3387A.

Pallas, A. (1987). The high cost of high standards: School reform and dropouts. Urban Education, 22, 1, 103-114.

Rutter, M., Maugham, B., Mortimer, P., Oriston, J., and Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sinclair, R.I. (1970). Towards schools that are responsive to students. National Elementary Principal, 49, 5, 53-58.

Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In Tagiuri, R. and Litwin, G.H. (Eds.), Organizational climate: Exploration of a concept. Boston, MA: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.

Willower, D.J., Eidell, T.L., and Hoy, W.K. (1967). The school and pupil control ideology. The Pennsylvania State University Studies, No. 24. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Wynne, E.A. (1980). Looking at the schools: Good, bad, and indifferent. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

APPENDIX A

The Effective School Battery developed by Gottfredson (1984) was chosen for the purpose of this evaluation due to its evident validity and reliability as well as its wide use in secondary schools.

OREA used only one "school climate" section of The Effective School Battery. Gottfredson reported internal consistency reliability estimates between .65 and .94 for each scale. He also reported evidence of convergent/divergent validity and scale changes in expected ways when school improvement projects are implemented.

Thirty-one items comprise the student form of the instrument, which contains the following six subscales: safety, respect for students, planning and action, fairness of rules, and student influence. The teacher survey consists of 59 items covering the following scales: safety, morale, planning and action, smooth administration, resources, race relations, parent/community involvement, student influence, and avoidance of grades as a sanction. The race relations scale was omitted from the instrument for the purpose of this study.

SAMPLE

For each school in the evaluation sample, a random sample of ten teachers was selected to complete the teacher form of The Effective School Battery. In addition, students enrolled in a random sample of three language arts classes in each school

sampled were asked to complete the student form of the survey. In most cases this student sample included both A.I.D.P. and non-A.I.D.P. students, in order to obtain a representative view of the school as a whole. After OREA administered the original form of the student questionnaire, objections were raised by several teachers. As a result, OREA deleted five items from the student instrument. The psychometric properties of the instrument reported here refer only to the common items which were answered by all students. Responses from the five questions that were subsequently deleted from the instrument were not analyzed.

RELIABILITY

The internal consistency reliability for the teacher and student instruments as they were used by OREA is reported in Tables A-1 and A-2 respectively.

Reliability results obtained from the teacher survey are generally good, with the exception of the avoidance of grades as a sanction scale. This can probably be attributed to the fact that that scale consisted of only two items. The reliability results of the student survey were not nearly as good. This may be partially attributed to the deletion of the five items from the instrument. The only scale on that instrument which demonstrates internal consistency is the safety scale, which contains thirteen items. Internal consistency analyses could not be conducted on the respect for students scale, since only one item was used after the deletions.

Table A-1

Reliability Results for Teacher Responses on The Effective School Battery.

Scale	# of Items	# of Responses	Alpha
Parent Involvement	6	118	.49
*Avoidance of Grades as a Sanction	2	135	4.03
Student Influence	5	147	.57
Resources	4	147	.69
Smooth Administration	12	121	.85
Planning	9	127	.70
Safety	10	78	.89
Morale	11	132	.83

*=Due to the small number of items contained on this scale, an unexpected and out of range value was obtained for coefficient alpha as a result, this scale was not used for further analysis.

Table A-2

Reliability Results for Student Responses *
on The Effective School Battery.

Scale	# of Items	# of Responses	Alpha
Clarity	4	1551	.36
Fairness	2	1569	.39
Student Influence	2	368	.07
Planning	3	1562	.31
Safety	13	1550	.74

*In general, reliability estimated for the student climate scales was poor. This may be a function of the small number of items contained on all but one scale. It should be noted, however, that the safety scale which contained thirteen items proved useful in subsequent analyses.

APPENDIX B

Summary of Significant Correlations

The Relationship Between 1987-88 AIDP Program Outcomes and Climate Variables Measured

Pass Rate 87-88

Home visit contact rate (contacts/visits)	(.70) p < .01
Captive Lunch?	(.63) p < .01
# PPC meetings principal attended	(.59) p < .05
Communication betw. facil. and parents (f rt)	(.58) p =.01
% students who receive reduced lunch	(.52) p < .05

Pass Rate Improvement

# PPC meetings attended by principal	(.57) p < .05
Floor integrity (from School Scorecard)	(.52) p < .05

Pass Rate Objective 1987-88

% students who receive reduced-price lunch	(.69) p < .01
Home visit contact rate (contacts/visits)	(.53) p < .05
# PPC meetings principal attended	(.53) p < .05
% students in extended day prgms	(.52) p < .05
# student pregnancies (principal estimate)	(-.46) p =.05

Difference in Pass Rate Objective

% students receiving home visits	(.68) p < .05

Attendance Rate 87-88

Captive lunch?	(.78) p <.01
% Male	(.71) p < .05
% Asian students	(.67) p < .05
% Hispanic students	(-.67) p < .01
% White students	(.58) p < .05
Use of Adult volunteers	(.55) p < .05
% of students that received calls	(.54) p < .05
% of students who receive grp guidance	(.54) p <.05
# of phone calls made to home	(.52) p < .05
Students' perception of student influence	(-.50) p < .05
# of telephone contacts	(.46) p = .05
Mean number of calls per student	(.46) p = .05

f rt= facilitator rating

Improvement in Attendance Rate 87-88

% Asian students	(. 83) p < .01
% Hispanic students	(-.64) p < .01
Mean # of calls per student	(.61) p < .01
Use adult volunteers?	(.55) p < .05
Teacher perceptions of planning	(.53) p < .05
Captive lunch?	(.54) p < .05
Students' perception of student influence	(-.54) p < .05
# of phone contacts	(. 53) p < .05

Percent Improved Attendance 87-88

% Asian students	(.80) p < .01
Mean # of calls per student	(.66) p < .01
# phone contacts	(. 63) p < .01
% Students without phones	(-.55) p < .05
% Hispanic students	(-.51) p < .05
Captive Lunch?	(.50) p < .05
% of students who received calls	(.50) p < .05
Students' perception of student influence	(-.50) p < .05

DRP 1988

% of students who received calls	(.63) p < .01
% Asian students	(.62) p < .05
% Special Education	(-.59) p < .05
Use of Adult volunteers	(.57) p < .05
Communication betw. facil. and parents (f rt)	(.57) p = .01
% General Ed students	(.56) p < .05
n reduced lunch	(.55) p < .05
% students without phones	(-.55) p < .05
Call contact rate (contacts/calls)	(.54) p < .05
% LEP Special Ed	(-.53) p < .05
% of teachers in school 3+ years	(.50) p < .05
% problems w door operation	(-.49) p < .05
% of students whose parents guidance	(.48) p < .05
Captive lunch?	(.47) p < .05

DRP Improvement

Teacher perceptions of safety	(-.66) p < .01
Captive lunch	(.60) p < .01
# PPC meeting principal attended	(.53) p < .05
Teacher perceptions of planning	(.50) p < .05
# of drug incidents at school (prn rept)	(-.48) p < .05
# of Student Pregnancies (prn rept)	(-.46) p=.05
# of Student Staff Conflicts (prn rept)	(-.46) p=.05

MAT 1988

# General Education Students	(.68) p < .01
% problems w door operation (scorecard)	(-.67) p < .01
% students recvd group guidance	(.63) p < .01
Use adult volunteers?	(.61) p < .01
% Special Education students	(-.58) p < .05
% of students receiving phone calls	(.55) p < .05
% General Education students	(. 54) p < .05
Communication betw. facil. and parents	(.53) p < .05
# receive reduced lunch	(.52) p < .05
# of student/staff conflicts (prn report)	(-.51) p < .05
Students' perception of student influence	(-.48) p < .05
Captive lunch?	(.46) p =.05

MAT Improvement

# PPC meeting attended by principal	(.59) p < .01
Surface quality (school scorecard)	(-.52) p < .05